

TRANSLATION OR ADAPTATION? AUTHORS WRITING IN A SECOND
LANGUAGE: AN ANALYSIS OF STEFAN HEYM'S "HOSTAGES" AND "DER FALL
GLASENAPP"

BY

CHRISTINA R. SCHULTZ

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in German
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2010

Urbana, Illinois

Adviser:

Associate Professor Andrea Golato

ABSTRACT

Translation is considered an artistic, creative act, not unlike writing a novel: the translator strives to transfer the meaning of the original text into another language very carefully, precisely and accurately. The processes and methods of translating, however, are not universally agreed upon; some translators not rendering the original as faithfully as they could in the translation, removing the translated text from the realm of translation and into that of adaptation. Self-translation is a further issue complicating the matter of translation. This thesis addresses the self-translation of a particular novel, *Hostages* (1942) / *Der Fall Glasenapp* (1958), by Stefan Heym and seeks to answer the question whether or not the translation truly is a translation or an adaptation of the original novel.

For my loving family and friends

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I must begin by thanking the professor who introduced me to Stefan Heym – Gertrude Roesch. Without her, I might never have read his novel or written this thesis. But the person who made the thesis truly come to life was my adviser, Andrea Golato, who worked with me very patiently and supportively, quickly supplying me with illuminating feedback and keeping all avenues of communication open. I never felt alone or in the dark during the writing process, for which I have Andrea to thank. Many others helped me get through this process, including my family and friends – in particular my mom, Karin and Irene – who listened to me worry about my thesis and reassuring me that everything would be just fine. It turns out they were right.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER TWO: STEFAN HEYM	5
2.1 From Helmut Flieg to Stefan Heym: Humble Beginnings	5
2.2 From Rags to Riches – The Story Behind <i>Hostages</i>	14
2.3 <i>Hostages</i> (1942)	20
CHAPTER THREE: TRANSLATION METHODOLOGY	27
3.1 Translation: More Than Just Words	27
3.2 Everyone Makes Mistakes	32
3.3 Translation or Adaptation?	37
3.4 Self-Translation	41
3.5 Conclusion	45
CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS	46
4.1 Introduction	46
4.2 Acceptable Changes – Fixing Errors	47
4.3 Acceptable Changes – Audience Appropriate	50
4.4 Unacceptable Changes – Translation Oddities	51
4.5 Unacceptable Changes – Changes in Register, Insertions, Omissions, Form	54
CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS	66
5.1 Translation Assessment	66
5.2 Heym as (Self-)Translator	70
5.3 Conclusion	75
REFERENCES	77
APPENDIX A: POEM	80

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Stefan Heym, born Helmut Flieg, is one of the most fascinating authors of the 20th century in German literature. I discovered Heym in the spring of 2009 and I was immediately captivated. I had the pleasure of reading one of his novels, *Der Fall Glasenapp*, in a German graduate seminar with Prof. Gertrude Roesch. The seminar was entitled *Faktizität and Fiktionalität* (Fact and Fiction) and dealt with literature from the 20th century that encompassed real, historical figures or events (i.e., a character based on a specific person or directly named in the novel and/or historical events described and oftentimes reworked) into the fictional storylines.

Der Fall Glasenapp, published in 1958, is one such mixture of fact and fiction – it uses one real Nazi official as a supporting character and takes place during the Nazi occupation of Prague. The rest is an elaborate detective story about an incident that sparks off a chain of events, both big and small, in the lives of a handful of Nazi officers and officials and the Czech people. *Glasenapp* was well-written, engaging, thoughtful, insightful – all in all, my favorite German language novel to date.

I knew I wanted to delve deeper into Heym's literature and background, but what particularly caught my attention, was the fact that *Glasenapp* was a translation. The original story was written by none other than Heym himself in 1942, making *Glasenapp* a self-translation. It was originally entitled *Hostages* and was written in English. Self-translation became a topic of great interest to me and I decided to do some research.

As a student of translation, I have learned about various topics dealing with the

subject, but had never heard much about self-translation. I found out it is not typical, but some authors (among them Hannah Arendt and Klaus Mann) do it to reach a greater audience. Rather than have someone else, i.e., a professional translator, exert “control” over their novel, they translate it themselves and are able to convey their messages in not only one language, but in two or more languages. It seemed like the ultimate challenge to me as a writer and a translator and I felt a newfound respect for Stefan Heym’s works.

A German Jew growing up during a tumultuous time in Germany, Heym was practically forced into exile, learning English on the streets in America and after a few short years trusted himself enough to write novels in English. A passionately politically active figure throughout his lifetime, his novels discussed difficult topics like Nazism, Fascism, war, death, politics, human rights and the human experience in general. After enjoying varying degrees of success and writing many other novels, essays and articles, Heym went on to self-translate many of his own English novels (not just *Hostages*) among other things, for German-speaking readers.

Hostages, his very first novel – and his first English language novel – was published in 1942 and in 1958 in translation under the title *Der Fall Glasenapp* in Germany. Partially due to the fact that sixteen years passed between the two versions (and so much happened during this time in Heym’s life), I would argue that Heym did more than just “translate” *Hostages*; he molded it for a completely different audience and improved upon his amateurish (but initially successful) foray into literature.

I would like to analyze the two versions of the “same” book from a translator’s perspective through close readings in order to decide if *Der Fall Glasenapp* is indeed a translation or if it might not more aptly be called an adaptation. Ultimately, I show in this

thesis that *Hostages* is more like a rough draft and *Glazenapp* is the polished work of a veteran, despite the question of language. With personal translation experience it is easier to see the difficulties that translators might face and it was most informative and enlightening to read both versions of the novel and analyze the changes the original underwent from English to German.

In Chapter 2, I tell the story of Heym's life and what led him to write *Hostages* in English. His later career is, for this paper, of little interest; the main focus is on his life up until the publication of *Hostages* and the time in between the initial English version and his translation years later. I also provide the reader with the basic plot outline of the story *Hostages*, which will become important in later chapters.

Chapter 3 lays out a foundation for translation practices and methodology. This chapter will discuss translation methodology in general and the various scholarly, professional viewpoints about translation. A description and examples of commonplace translation practices for professional translators will be given, as well as, in contrast, those practices that would be considered an overstepping of the bounds the professional translator's duty. This will then lead into a discussion of the differences between a translation and an adaptation and when a translation goes "too far". Another important element of the chapter is the concept of self-translation. Since Heym is a self-translator, the scholarly opinions on self-translation are vital for the analysis of his translation of *Hostages*. The terms "bilingual" and "biculturality" will also be described in the context of self-translators and bilingual (and/or polyglot) writers.

Chapter 4 will then show the kinds of translation practices that took place in converting *Hostages* into *Der Fall Glazenapp*. A detailed analysis is given of the types of acceptable and unacceptable practices and various excerpts from the text highlight the key

differences between the two versions.

In the conclusion, Chapter 5, I assess the translation by chapter and as a whole to see what kind of translation *Der Fall Glasenapp* is: to determine whether or not one can consider Heym's translation a literal translation, a free translation or an adaptation. I also try to provide explanations for some of the noteworthy differences I found and explore further avenues of research in this field.

CHAPTER TWO

STEFAN HEYM

2.1 From Helmut Flieg to Stefan Heym: Humble Beginnings

The story of Stefan Heym's life is a fascinating one. He is described as a rebel (Hutchinson, 1992), a fighter of many causes (Hahn, 2003), a "forthright and provocative figure" (Hutchinson & Zachau, 2003, p. 7), a prolific writer (ibid.) and a major literary presence (Wallace, 2004). It is very difficult to find reviews or works that are wholly negative with regards to Heym's oeuvre. Some call him out on his amateurish or clichéd style (Bentley, 1943; Hutchinson, 1992; Wallace, 2004), but that is generally referring to his earlier works, the very earliest of which will be discussed in this paper.

Heym's first foray into literature produced a wonderful offering entitled *Hostages* (1942), which, as the title implies was not written in his native German but in English. This initially successful work has seen a risorgimento in the scholarly circle in the last 20 or 30 years because *Hostages* is more than just a wartime bestseller. It belongs to the genre of exile literature (Heym is mentioned among other great German exile writers such as Thomas and Klaus Mann and Rudolf Arnheim) (Hahn, 2003; Jung, 2002; Jung, 2004) and more specifically Heym is included among a group of authors who wrote in the language of their host country (which Thomas Mann could not boast). This added complexity makes *Hostages* a work definitely worth analyzing.

But with Heym being a native German speaker, the question naturally arises: What possessed Heym to write in a second language? This was not always a natural or common choice among exile writers, and Heym certainly did not exclusively write in English, having

published many newspaper articles in his early years in German. In order to illustrate why Heym wrote in English, it is necessary to look into his complicated past.

Born April 10, 1913 in Chemnitz as Helmut Flieg,¹ his story at first appears rather ordinary. His father, Daniel Flieg, was a Jewish, middle class salesman from Schrimm in the Prussian province of Posen (today Śrem, Poland) who decided to differentiate himself from the Eastern Europeans Jews, i.e., embrace his Prussian rather than Jewish heritage, and settle in Chemnitz (Heym, 1988). Daniel married Elsa Primo, the young, very attractive daughter of a junior manager at a hosiery and knitwear factory, and after Helmut was born, they had another son, Werner, at the close of World War I. They were a very respectable family of German Jews and the Fliegs lived relatively comfortably up until the beginning of the Third Reich (ibid.).

In his lengthy autobiography *Nachruf* (written in German in the late 1980s), Heym mentions many things that played a significant role in his development. His grandmother Jenny committed suicide when he was young and he calls this “der erste Fall von Selbstmord in der an Selbstmördern reichen Familie des S. H.” (Heym, 1988, p. 9). He had fond memories of his grandparents and after his grandmother took her own life, his grandfather passed away shortly thereafter. This seemed to have shaken the young boy significantly. The other major case of suicide in his family was of his father, brought on by very different circumstances, which will be mentioned later.

Helmut also remembers seeing “die Revolution” as a child with his father. En route to a theater they witnessed a group of protestors, the beginnings of the proletariat revolution and the politically unstable time of the Weimar Republic. This memory greatly influenced the

¹ Until his official name change later in his life (and later in this thesis), Stefan Heym will be referred to as Helmut to keep the two phases of his life separate and to avoid confusion.

young boy: “So tritt die Revolution in das Bewusstsein des Kindes (Heym, 1988, p. 12).

Helmut’s early years at school were a time of change in Germany and with such past experiences, it is no wonder Helmut was very sensitive as a child. The years after the war proved to be ones of financial difficulty, even the well-off Flieg family began to feel the depression that had gripped Germany. The newly created republic was trying to rebuild itself and this led to a very tense and divided country. Anti-Semitism was on the rise and this further separated Helmut from his classmates. He wanted to fit in at school, but he was very shy and his introverted nature led him to indulge in his creative, more imaginative side.

Heym reflects on being Jewish in school:

“Der Gedanke, dies könnte der Andersartigkeit seiner Eltern wegen sein, also weil er jüdisch war, kam ihm schon im zweiten oder dritten Jahr seiner Volksschulzeit; er konnte sein Judentum auch nicht verbergen, weil er vom allgemeinen Religionsunterricht...befreit war...und beim Rabbiner Fuchs jüdische Geschichte und beim Lehrer Sommerfeld Hebräisch lernen mußte...” (Heym, 1988, p. 17)

After a while, his classmates just ignored him, and he became a subject of ridicule, even from his teachers! One of the causes for this was his name, which he hated. “Dieser verfluchte Name. Helmut...war schon schlimm genug...und dann noch Flieg! Wie konnte einer einen Imperativ zum Namen haben, dazu einen, der sich nicht erfüllen ließ; höchstens herausfliegen konnte man, woraus heraus, aus der Gruppe natürlich, der Gemeinschaft” (Heym, 1988, p. 23). This open condemnation of his name, brought on by the taunting of teachers and classmates alike, is a more deeply rooted, psychological reason for his later name change (and not the more obvious reason of Nazi persecution).

Helmut’s “otherness” led him to go against his teachers, always questioning them and deciding to conduct his own research and read what he liked. Around the time of his Bar Mitzvah, his father tried to bring him into the family business but Helmut had no interest in it;

he felt he had a higher calling. He claimed he wanted to fight for “die unterdrückten Juden...[d]enn Schiller ruft,” saving the oppressed from their oppressors (Heym, 1988, p. 35). And because Helmut was a naturally intelligent but introverted boy, he eventually found a way to do so: writing. He began writing poetry; the date of his very first poem has been debated. Heym states the first poem he wrote was entitled “Ballade vom Sucher nach Gerechtigkeit” (in which the protagonist commits suicide), written on May 6, 1931. Peter Hutchinson, in one of his interviews with Heym, said Heym discovered an even earlier poem that was published in the *Chemnitzer Volksstunde* in February 1930 called “Nie Wieder Krieg!” There was also a poem called “Melancholie vom 5. Stock”, which appeared in an anthology in September 1931 (Hutchinson, 1992).³ As the titles of his earliest poems suggest, his themes were generally anti-war and gloomy. Regardless of the title and date of his very first poem, the fact remains that he was a mere teenager and had already been published several times.

Now that he had found a creative outlet, Helmut felt he was able to voice his opinions in a constructive way. Sadly his opinions were not exactly popular ones during the 1930s. The course of German history was taking a turn for the worse. The Weimar Republic was failing, the depression only worsening, the Nazi party was gaining popularity and Anti-Semitism was a daily reality. One day Hitler came to Chemnitz and the young man was able to witness this powerfully persuasive man up close as his motorcade traveled through the city; he was not impressed. Young Helmut definitely could not understand the furor over the *Führer*. He described Hitler in the following way:

“Alles an ihm war schlecht proportioniert, Kopf, Schultern, Gesäß, dazu das eiförmige Gesicht mit der schmierigen Tolle über der Stirn, dem ordinären Mund, dem schwarzen Bürstchen unter der irgendwie unfertigen Nase...Der junge Flieg sah das alles...und fand den Mann, seine Aufmachung, seine Gesten, lächerlich...Der ist kein Prophet und kein Held, der schafft’s nicht” (Heym, 1988, pp. 48-9).

But young Helmut was only half-right. Hitler was able to convince enough people to follow him and his ideas, making him one of the most despised and oft-depicted personages of the 20th and 21st century.

Because of Hitler and the Nazis, Helmut's newfound joy in writing was short-lived. Upon writing a "ziemlich banale Reim" (Heym, 1988, p. 50) entitled "Exportengeschäft" in 1931, his fate was sealed (the poem in German and in an English translation can be found in Appendix A). Only 18 years old, Helmut wrote something that he felt so strongly about, regardless of the fact that the poem criticized the German Reichswehr. It was published in the *Chemnitzer Volksstimme* on September 7, 1931 under his birth name and the poem appeared throughout the city, and although proud of his achievement, his dissent and criticism got him into trouble with the Nazis (see below) and with the community at large (according to Heym (1988), he was beaten up at school after the poem was published); Helmut Flieg was now a marked man. His mother was visibly shaken, pleading Helmut to think of the consequences for his family, their business and the Jewish community.

There was a report published by the editorial staff in the *Chemnitzer Tageblatt* on October 1, 1931 (which appears as a facsimile in *Beiträge*, 1973) following Nazi meetings discussing Helmut's poem and the young man's fate in Chemnitz. The report revealed the Nazi's feelings toward Helmut: they denounced him, claiming he was unworthy to be at a German school and discussed the whole "embarrassing" situation and Helmut's attack on every German soul, the German culture and the German officers.

After this scandal Helmut was forced to leave everything behind in Chemnitz and entered a school in Berlin where he received his high school diploma in March 1932. He began studying at the Humboldt University of Berlin and became active in literary, theatrical,

and political circles. His new ambition was to become a journalist, with newspaper articles appearing as early as July 1932 in *Berlin am Morgen* (Hutchinson, 1992). However, Helmut had to keep a low profile because of the Nazis' watchful eye and he signed his very first article "F-g", one of several pennames he used before settling on the one that would remain with him until the end of his life in 2001. Very few articles were actually signed "Helmut Flieg" and wisely so, but Helmut and his family still could not escape the pressure of the Nazis.

At the outset of 1933, a series of terrifying events took place, threatening the lives of all political deviants and according to Peukert (1987) it was a time at which freedom died. The *Machtergreifung* occurred on January 30, 1933 and the *Reichstagsbrand*, happening only weeks later on the night of February 27, 1933, allowed Hitler and the Nazis to pass the *Ermächtigungsgesetz* another month later on March 23, 1933 (Peukert, 1987). Now the Nazis had a "legal basis for their subsequent acts of terror and suppression" (Hutchinson, 1992, p. 17). These deceptive tactics gave Hitler the power to eliminate anyone standing in his way and persecuted "those who dared to insist on an interpretation of reality not approved by official Nazi channels" (Hahn, 2003, p. 11).

After the events of 1933, life for Helmut Flieg in Berlin and his family back home in Chemnitz worsened. On March 12, 1933, Helmut's younger brother Werner came to Berlin with news that would further change Helmut's life. Their father was taken hostage in an attempt to scare Helmut out of his "hiding place" in Berlin. Werner, at the behest of their mother, urged Helmut to leave Germany immediately. Luckily, the Nazi officials did not detain Daniel Flieg indefinitely; he was released but later, like so many others, committed suicide. Heym later asked himself if he was responsible for his father's death (Heym, 1988)

but at the time, as Hutchinson very appropriately states: “At the age of nineteen, [Helmut] was Germany’s youngest literary exile” (1992, p. 17).

Following his mother’s orders, Helmut once again left everything behind and wondered how one escaped Berlin. Not yet twenty years old, anxious and alone, he somehow managed to leave the bustling metropolis and his journey took him to Prague. There he had a few connections, the most notable of which was Egon Erwin Kisch (1885-1948), another Jewish writer who was also later forced into exile. Shortly after arrival at Kisch’s home, a young woman escorted Helmut to her family’s apartment where he was to stay until he could find a place of his own. On the way they stopped at the post office so Helmut could send his mother a postcard informing her that he was safe, but he could not think of what to sign it with. His own name would certainly be a mistake and after finding an acceptable sounding name, Helmut Flieg became Stefan Heym.

This name change offered the new Stefan Heym a kind of protection. Heym managed to stay in Prague working here and there, earning money by writing for various newspapers and continuing his anti-fascist fight. This went on for two years but eventually the Nazis learned of the former Helmut Flieg’s whereabouts, they even discovered his new penname. Even though Heym enjoyed his time in Prague, the close proximity to the Third Reich was still dangerous.

In 1935, a fellow “comrade” asked if Heym would be interested in going to America and told him about the Jewish fraternity, Phi Sigma Delta, “die irgendwie Geld aufgebracht habe, um deutschen jüdischen Studenten eine Fortsetzung ihres durch den Machtantritt der Nazis unterbrochenen Studiums in Amerika zu ermöglichen” (Heym, 1988, p. 125). At first he was not enthusiastic about the idea, although he knew America was the land of

opportunity; he would be farther away from his family and had just begun to build relationships and connections in Prague. However, Heym's friend reminded him that he would just be waiting around for something to change in Germany, which could take years. That argument convinced Heym and everything seemed to fall into place (Heym, 1988); it was kismet.

Heym received the scholarship from Phi Sigma Delta to the University of Chicago. Room and board were covered, all Heym had to do was pay for his passage across the Atlantic. He was able to pay his way through writing. But before setting sail, he began feverishly learning as much English as he could from a certain Comrade Mirsky. Mirsky's crash course focused on practical, every day topics like "At the train station," "At a restaurant," "Going hiking" and "A visit to the museum" (Heym, 1988, p. 128, translations mine). Unfortunately for Heym, Mirsky's English accent was strange, his grammar imperfect and his vocabulary lacking, but this was enough to prepare Heym for his first real contact with English on American soil (although he later jokingly [?] shows just how "good" his English à la Mirsky was with the following: "Plihss, währ iss ze Dabbl-juh Ssih?") (Heym, 1988, p. 128/139).

The minute he set foot in America (he was briefly in New York before making his way to Chicago), Heym was forced to dive headlong into the English-speaking world. He realized English was his only chance at becoming truly successful and made learning the new language his job:

"Er muß die Sprache erfassen binnen Wochen, Monaten höchstens, mit Begriffen, die sich in keinem Dictionnaire finden und die ihren Sinn immerzu ändern, eine Sprache, durch Presse, Film, Technik, Sport, Jazz in ständigem Wandel begriffen, eine Sprache, die ihn durch ihre ganz eigene Logik reizt, da diese ein klareres Denken erfordert als das wolkige Deutsch. Er muß diese Sprache sprechen und verstehen, sonst wird man ihn nicht verstehen, und er muß verstanden werden, will er eine Zukunft hier haben"

(Heym, 1988, 142).

Not only was he surrounded with English at the University, he got to know Chicago and the language of everyday life from the streets.

Heym successfully graduated with an M.A. in German literature in December 1936. After he finished his degree, he immediately began where he left off in Prague – writing for newspapers and fighting fascism (albeit in German) (Hahn, 2003). The first of his journalistic endeavors was writing for the anti-fascist monthly, *Volksfront*, published in Chicago.

Whatever Heym did, apparently he did it well because he was invited to become the chief editor of a weekly newspaper, *Deutsches Volksecho*, published in New York (Hutchinson, 1992). *Volksecho* was a voice for the Communist Party in America and claimed it wanted to be “das Echo und der Ruf des Volkes” for the German-American public (Hutchinson & Zachau, 2003, p. 16).

Heym then left the Windy City for the Big Apple and this move could be considered the point at which Heym’s career as a writer began to take off. His subsequent work for *Volksecho* was his most ambitious and accomplished journalistic effort of his early years and it earned him lots of respect and renown in the German-American community. Hutchinson proves this when he states: “To get Thomas Mann to make Heym’s paper the only one for which he gave interviews was therefore a considerable coup. It must be ascribed to Heym’s energy, commitment, and a certain magnetic charm” (Hutchinson, 1992, p. 28). *Volksecho* had two major competitors so this was a major achievement on Heym’s part.

The first issue of *Volksecho* appeared in February 1937 and the very last issue came in September 1939. The paper was a labor of love for Heym and financial issues forced him to close it down in the end. The time he spent with *Volksecho* was a chance for him to spread

“[t]he truth about the Nazis, instead of their propaganda...and antifascists and exiles hoped that the truth would lead to oppositional action” (Hahn, 2003, p. 26). He kept exiles informed in order to promote public debate; in Heym’s eyes, public debate, not resignation, would help crush the fascists. Heym, like other exile writers of his time, believed they were the voice of the silenced German people and worked ceaselessly to further his cause. Due to his “obviously left-wing tendencies and not yet total command of English, jobs in the mass-circulation dailies were clearly closed to him” (Hutchinson, 1992, p. 30). Hence, after *Volksecho* folded, it was hard for him to find another full-time job.

Nothing seemed to stand in Heym’s way, however, despite the less than positive job market. He found work with various printers and tried to write plays but nothing really worked out. Max Pfeffer was Heym’s literary agent and he gave Heym advice that would later save the fledgling writer from unemployment and really launch his career: write a novel. And that he did. That first novel is what I would now like to discuss, as it is the focus of analysis in later chapters.

2.2 From Rags to Riches – The Story Behind *Hostages*

Hostages might not have come about were it not for Max Pfeffer’s advice. Everyone in New York wrote plays, so Broadway was out of Heym’s reach. A native German speaker who had only written for newspapers and had limited play writing experience would have no place in New York’s competitive scene.² It was wartime and what better way to fight fascism than to write a novel about it? It would be a fitting outlet for Heym, who, as Hutchinson (1992, p. 35) observed, “wished to continue the monitory work of the *Volksecho* on a broader,

² Heym co-authored a play with Hans Burger entitled *Tom Sawyers großes Abenteuer. Jugendstück nach Mark Twain in 6 Bildern* in 1934-5. It was staged in Prague and Vienna after he had left for America (*Beiträge*, 1973).

English-language canvas, and to expose Nazi brutality and the fascist mind”. A novel would also give Heym a fighting chance at success. Moved by his father’s brief captivity under the Nazis, Heym was intrigued by the psychological aspects of being a hostage: “Was geht vor in einem Menschen, der da als Geisel in der Zelle sitzt? Oder in einer Gruppe solcher Menschen? Was empfinden sie, vor allem für diejenigen, an deren Stelle sie geopfert werden sollen?” (Heym, 1988, p. 228) These questions of psychological behavior are present throughout *Hostages*.

Heym’s time in Prague was important in the development of his first novel. He had grown very fond of the city and knew it well, which is evident in *Hostages*:

“Für Heym spiegelt Prag mit seiner Geschichte und seinen politischen Problemen besser als jede andere europäische Stadt das ‘charming’ und morbide alte Europa wider. Wie gut Heym die Atmosphäre des besetzten Prag in seinem Roman eingefangen hatte wird schon daran deutlich, dass das Attentat auf Reinhard Heydrich erst *nach* Erscheinen des Buches stattfand” (Zachau, 2003, p. 18).³

The use of Prague as the setting for the book was a wise choice because the city was fresher in his mind and the city lends itself to the plot perfectly. Heym’s first more temporary lodgings, including the old landlady, in Prague became one of the settings in the novel (Heym, 1988).

The bigger decision for Heym, however, was to choose which language to write the novel in: German or English? He knew that writing his first major novel in anything other than his native language would be quite risky and very brave. A language is “mehr als Grammatik und Wortschatz, sie ist ein Wesen, das atmet und wächst und sich verändert...” (Heym, 1988, p. 230) and with putting the pen to paper in English there was an even bigger challenge: Heym wanted to go beyond textbook English and be able to use idiomatic English

³ Heym preemptively wrote about an assassination attempt on the high-ranking Nazi official, Reinhard Heydrich, which took place on May 27, 1942. A group of Czechs attacked him and Heydrich died a few days later due to complications from his injuries.

in order to make his novel readable to an American public. Not only would the language be difficult, but there would be cultural references to consider. Would an American public understand everything a born-and-raised German author wrote about and how could Heym avoid such references without losing the essence of his story? Even though these questions are problematic, Zachau observes that there were positives to Heym's situation. He states that "Heym's Biographie und sein Exilhintergrund machten ihn und sein Buch für Amerikaner interessant, die seit dem Kriegsausbruch 1941 mehr über Europa wissen wollten" (Zachau, 2003, p. 18). The war was a point of curiosity and fascination for Americans, so the novel would have a willing audience.

Regardless of the linguistic and cultural aspects and difficulties, there were many reasons, i.e., additional advantages, for Heym's choice to write in English (Heym, 1988). He first lists the fact that the German publishers were worthless, now more than ever during wartime. Paper was extremely hard to come by and in Germany especially, many of the publishers were forced to close up shop or work underground, often with limited staff. These were obviously not good conditions for publishing a book with such a critical message that Heym felt compelled to write about. It certainly would not be promoted and the readership would be abysmally low in Europe. Secondly, if he were to write in German, the American publishers would demand a translation of the German text, which would cost money (and would most likely have to be financed by Heym) and take time and effort. As a third reason he says he wanted to let his presence be known in the literary and the political circles. He wanted this book to be taken seriously and he knew that writing in English would secure a wider audience than in Germany at this time, due to the harshly critical stance of the Nazis. And lastly, he was also excited to try his hand at this new language. He claimed that English

syntax demanded “logisches Denken und sträubt sich gegen die Willkür” (Heym, 1988, p. 230) and was linguistically less challenging because “in ihr ist eine Miss tatsächlich feminin und nicht, wie ein Fräulein, ein Neutrum” (ibid.). One could argue that English is the antithesis of logical and is as random and haphazard a language as any, but in comparison with the German grammar, his logic was quite sound.⁴ He seemed to ask: How hard could it be to write in a language that is genderless? And perhaps he chose to write in English simply because the challenge excited him.

A further motivation for his choice of language, which Zachau claims was Heym’s main reason, was his relationship with the American writer Gertrude Gelbin who would later become Heym’s wife. Zachau describes Gelbin as

“einer intellektuellen New Yorker Sozialistin, die, selbst Schriftstellerin, ihm bei der Korrektur seines Erstlings *Hostages* zur Hand ging. Das Stefan-Heym-Archiv in Cambridge enthält das Original-Manuskript von *Hostages* mit Gertrude Gelbins Korrekturanmerkungen, die seine Germanizismen sorgfältig anglisierte. Hier wird deutlich, dass ohne die rigorose Kritik und Bearbeitung durch seine spätere Frau aus dem Exilanten Helmut Flieg niemals der Amerikaner Stefan Heym geworden wäre...” (Zachau, 2003, p. 16-17).

This praise of Gelbin’s editing role is, in my opinion, a bit high; it would very interesting to see what *Hostages* would have looked like without any of her help because the language is still awkward and lacking a consistent American-English sounding tone.

This leads me to the following question: How good was Heym’s English? After being in America for a few years before working on *Hostages*, Heym’s English surely must have been very good. But was it adequate enough for him to write a novel in the colloquial, idiomatic, fluid English he hoped he had learned? This question is central and somewhat problematic. The reviews of the novel were nothing but positive, but the linguistic aspects

⁴ At least I, as a native English speaker and someone who has struggled with the German language for years, agree with Heym and would label his logic sound. This is, of course, open to interpretation.

were completely left out. This could be partly due to the fact that the novel was touted as the work of a German émigré and that no one deemed it a worthwhile cause to critique his English language skills. That the novel is extraordinarily well thought-out and moving is clear, but being written by a non-native speaker of English, a native speaker surely must have noticed linguistic and/or syntactical errors or stylistic oddities. They may not always be immediately obvious to the reader, but they are definitely there: the awkward passages, one-to-one translations of phrases from German into English, little anomalies that an English speaker would be sure to catch.⁵

As mentioned previously, Heym had access to linguistic help through Gertrude Gelbin. With pressure from the American publishing house G. P. Putnam's Sons to finish the novel as quickly as possible, Gelbin's editorial assistance was essential to Heym. She alone was the editor and proofreader of *Hostages*, no sources making mention of Heym having help through any other channels.

Heym began writing an outline in the summer of 1942 and worked feverishly on the novel. Putnam's sent him to Merriewoode, a beautiful woodsy part of New Hampshire, for eight weeks with a modest weekly paycheck so he could devote his time to writing. Books on the war and denouncing Nazis were not exactly few and far between; Putnam's was trying to cover itself from what they thought was an impending overkill on the subject of war. Perhaps the extreme pressure explains the less-than-perfect editing.

Even further proof of Putnam's fear of taking on the Heym project was the fact that the rights for the movie had been sold even before *Hostages* was finished. Upon returning from Merriewoode, the finished manuscript in hand, Heym found out that "die Firma

⁵ I will be analyzing Heym's use of English more specifically in later chapters.

Paramount die Filmrechte an seinem Roman zu kaufen beabsichtigt: für 20 000 Dollar, heißt es, eine für ihn unfaßbare Summe...” (Heym, 1988, p. 244). Shortly thereafter the book went to press and on October 16, 1942, it was on the shelves.

Hostages catapulted Heym to sudden fame. The reviews were simply glowing. The well-known New York Times critic Orville Prescott wrote that *Hostages* was

“a book that unquestionably will be ranked with the finest novels of 1942, if not of a much longer period...It is the best novel I have seen about life under the Nazis, the undying revolt of the supposedly conquered peoples and the methods by which the Nazis strive to rule...and as a work of fiction and an example of story-telling, *Hostages* is vastly superior, tense, tautly constructed, swift and terrible” (reprinted as a facsimile in *Beiträge*, 1973).

With such high praise – Heym said *Hostages* received “nur Lob, ohne Einschränkung” (Heym, 1988, p. 248) – Heym was more than ecstatic about his literary breakthrough. The film was also reviewed in 1943, shortly after the film was released; the reviewer felt this movie was no triumph, calling it “dull” and stating that it “lacks excitement” and “fails to entertain” (*Hostages*, 1943). This was no fault of Heym’s, however. Paramount made the movie as hastily as Putnam pushed Heym to write.

As mentioned above, the reviewers, contemporary or otherwise, did not take notice of any language issues, although there were plenty to be found. The only starkly critical essays I have encountered were those of Ian Wallace, Emeritus Professor of German at the University of Bath, and Eric Russell Bentley, a British-born American literary and theater critic.

Wallace calls Heym’s English “seriously blemished,” “defective,” “fractured,” and “far from perfect” (2004, p.1). Wallace even goes so far as to say, “the English is so clearly (and almost comically) wrong that the average American reader must have been left scratching his or her head...” (ibid.). Most modern English readers would most likely (but unfortunately) see the validity in those statements. Bentley’s review, published in 1943, did

not go into as much detail as Wallace, but called Heym's work an "artistic failure" and very nonchalantly wrote off all Nazi literature as "all clichés and caricatures" (p. 316). The fact that almost all literary reviews of *Hostages* gloss over the linguistic aspects is curious, but despite its often odd uses of the English language, *Hostages* was noticed because as Prescott said, it was a marvelous novel.

2.3 *Hostages* (1942)

Set as a detective thriller in 1941 Nazi-occupied Prague, the beginning of the story reveals to the readers that the crime (a "missing" Nazi officer, Glasenapp, later found dead) was in fact not a crime but a suicide. The ensuing cover up of the suicide by the Nazis, prompted by the high ranking Nazi official Reinhardt, leads to the death of the innocent bystanders at the scene of the crime. Hahn makes the following observation about the way Heym modifies the popular and well-established genre of detective novels:

"Heym uses the form of a detective novel, but he does so with a twist that calls into question commonly accepted definitions and traditional values. His criminals have committed no crime; they are guilty only in so far as they have not violently overthrown the Nazi regime. And his Nazi 'detective' Reinhardt – who represents irrational power and injustice rather than law and order – inadvertently discloses the truth, not about the case of Glasenapp but about the Nazis' lack of legitimacy" (2003, p. 62).

The use of Reinhardt as a detective is one of the few examples that make readers not want the truth to be discovered: no one is on a Nazi detective's side. When the truth is discovered, it is not the typical happy ending with the case being successfully solved and shut. The truth is manipulated, as I will explain below.

The beginning scene takes place in an unassuming locale called the Café Mánes where

we are greeted by the equally unassuming hero of the novel, Janoshik.⁶ The physically slow, but mentally clever janitor (or lavatory attendant, as some sources call him) is called upon to clean up the mess made by the very drunk German officer Glasenapp. As Janoshik emerges from the corridor, mop and bucket in hand, the scene is tense. The group of German officers Glasenapp was a part of begins speaking loudly in German (and at that time, many Czechs spoke German) and becomes increasingly insulting of the Czechs present at the bar. Janoshik signals to one of the guests, a man named Breda, “with whom he must speak, and who must get away safely” (Heym, 1942, p. 7), to leave before things get ugly. Janoshik returns to his corridor and notices Glasenapp is nowhere to be found. Alluding to a side door leading outside, Janoshik wonders if the officer wandered out onto the jetty, which conveniently enough had no railing “to keep one from tumbling into the Moldau River” (ibid.). The seed of the suicide solution has been planted in the readers’ – and Janoshik’s – minds before the Nazis hear about the incident.

Janoshik and Breda, in the privacy of the lavatory, have discussed the logistics of an upcoming plan and as Breda rejoins the people in the bar, what follows is to be expected. Breda slips out the same door Glasenapp must have used and the Nazis look for their missing officer; he appears to have vanished without a trace. All the guests are to be detained until the police arrive. They are naturally all treated as suspects before an official investigation is conducted and without any evidence to incriminate them. The Nazi officers try to piece together the story and in the end, all eighteen of the unlucky guests (and employees) present at Café Mánes are taken to headquarters.

One of the officers in particular, a certain Gruber, and his interrogation methods

⁶ Janoshik is supposedly based off of the character Švejk from Jaroslav Hašek’s *The Good Soldier Švejk* (1912), a cunning man who outwits his interrogators by letting them think he is dimwitted (Hutchinson, 1992, p. 35-6).

showed the lack of reason and decency, the blind obedience and unjust ways of the Nazis:

“Young Gruber had had very little police training...One thing, however, had been drilled into his skull – that he and his colleagues lived among enemies, that they were the objects of fierce hatred, and that in any and all cases it was best to use the most ruthless measures. Justice was something that existed only in a higher sense – as far as it benefited the cause of Germany and of Adolf Hitler. The individual counted only in so far as he furthered that cause. Otherwise he had no rights and was to be dealt with harshly” (Heym, 1942, p. 23).

Heym constantly makes a case for his argument that although Nazi methods are (unfortunately) effective, they are unjust and undemocratic. His portrayal of Nazis as unintelligent bullies whose power is obtained solely through physical means like guns and muscle goes against everything his new homeland (i.e., America) stands for. Through Breda and Janoshik, Heym tries to delegitimize the Nazi regime by showing their flawed logic for justifying their crimes. A crime turns into a commendable deed as long as it furthers the Nazi cause, their lust for power is like the weather, unpredictable and uncontrollable, and even law-abiding citizens are unsafe. The whole world is turned upside down under Nazi fascist rule.⁷

Reinhardt goes through Glasenapp's personal files and discovers an unfinished, and rather ambiguous, letter written to a certain Milada that just “smacked of suicide” (Heym, 1942, p. 30) leaving Reinhardt puzzled. Who is this Milada? And who is this “he” that Glasenapp wanted to bring back to Milada? As Reinhardt ponders these questions he comes up with a devious plan. Why not cover up the suicide and use Glasenapp as a heroic tale of assassination to use against the enemy? The Milada mentioned in the letter was the only

⁷ The entire plot of *Hostages* is built upon Nazi lies to preserve their warped image of reality. Heym could not have hit closer to the truth: “Yes, the Gestapo built its entire case on the lie of Glasenapp's murder. Well – practically everything it did was based on lies. On the other hand, Breda knew, there was a certain kind of warped logic which the Nazis used to justify their deeds – in this logic, theft became socialism; murder, self-defense; rape, improvement and strengthening of the race. They would burn down their own house of parliament; but they had no courage to stand up to their deed, and put on elaborate trials to prove somebody else did it; they would attack country after country, each time issuing magnificent collections of documents to prove that, really, Germany had been attacked. In spite of the magnitude of their crimes, they were small-time gangsters without the grandeur of confessing to their acts – cowardly conquerors, petty crooks with the ambition to be considered gentlemen, always talking loudly about their historic significance because already they could hear the ironic laugh with which history would one day close its books on them” (Heym, 1942, pp. 93-4).

person who could figure out what happened to Glasenapp so she must be found and hushed up. A wanted ad for Glasenapp's murderer was to be posted all over Prague offering a hefty reward for information about what happened the night of Thursday, October 9, 1941. The hostages had one week to live. If no one came forward, they would be shot. All Reinhardt cared about was the "publicity" this would bring and he was immediately excited about his devious plan.

Meanwhile, the hostages are split up into various cells. The main cell is the one containing Janoshik, Lev Preissinger, Dr. Walter Wallenstein, Prokosch and Lobkovitz. The readers see how the Nazis cruelly treat them and how the hostages react to being given only one week to live. Dr. Wallenstein writes a psychological report on what happens during that time. Preissinger breaks down, the most well-off of the hostages, believing his importance and business connections to the Nazis would save him, which in the end he realizes means nothing. Prokosch and Lobkovitz were both involved with the same woman and what Prokosch believed to be his child with her, Lobkovitz reveals was his own. This revelation causes them to fight and cry, both discussing their lives in detail. The only one who remains calm and collected is Janoshik. It is clear that he is part of the underground resistance and just as Reinhardt has devised a brilliant plan to use the Glasenapp suicide to his benefit, Janoshik devises a plan to connect with Breda. But in the meantime, Breda realizes that Janoshik most likely was arrested and sees a young woman who acts very strangely after the news of Glasenapp's death is the new topic of discussion at the factory where Breda and the young woman work. He asks to meet with her and the young woman is none other than the very same Milada from Glasenapp's letter (which the readers know immediately) and Breda finds out the reason why Glasenapp committed suicide. He loved Milada and lied to her about the

death of her boyfriend Pavel, a student among a group of protestors whom Glasenapp and other Nazi officers shot to death. She was hurt and never wanted to see him again and Glasenapp's guilt for lying to Milada pushed him over the edge, literally. Glasenapp's lack of masculinity was a disgrace to the Nazis and Breda starts piecing together what really happened with the help of Milada.

What Reinhardt believes to be a harmless nitwit proves to be the most cunning character in the novel. All of the hostages get interrogated one by one and when it is Janoshik's turn, he weaves a massive web of lies in order to make Reinhardt think there is a letter hiding somewhere in the lavatory at the Café Mánes. Where it is, Janoshik cannot remember, and so he is escorted to the café and leaves a message behind for Breda to find. Breda does find the message and has a statement read on the radio foiling Reinhardt's plans. In the end, the hostages are still shot, but the greater good has been served. Breda and his men carried out the plan (that Janoshik and Breda discussed in the first chapter in the lavatory) of blowing up a munitions train on its way into Prague the day of the execution and just after Janoshik and the others are killed, panic hits the Gestapo complex. There is a multitude of explosions and in the aftermath, Reinhardt is called in to see his superior, Reinhard Heydrich. Heydrich dismisses Reinhardt from his position and has him transferred to the Eastern front. Nazis do not make mistakes and Reinhardt made a terrible mess of things for the Nazis.

This powerfully written novel is a platform for Heyms democratic ideals. Submissiveness and passivity are akin to crimes for Heym. The public must be active, with Janoshik and Breda as the perfect role models, in order to combat and challenge the ideas of the fascists. These are ideas that Heym wanted to make available to German speakers as well.

The fact that this took him sixteen years to accomplish is something that many are curious about. Heym seems to suggest he wanted to tackle the self-translation sooner:

“Es erschien in der DDR ziemlich spät erst, und zwar, weil ich mir vorgenommen hatte, die Übersetzung selbst zu machen. Ich hatte oft Schwierigkeiten mit der Übersetzung meiner Bücher ins Deutsche; Übersetzen ist überhaupt eine böse Sache, wenn einer die Sprache, in die sein Buch übersetzt wird, selber versteht. Ich nahm mir also vor, *Hostages* selber zu übersetzen, fand aber die Zeit nicht, und erst als ich ins Krankenhaus kam wegen irgendwelcher Herzbeschwerden und dort sechs Wochen liegen mußte, nahm ich mir ein Tonbandgerät und diktierte die Übersetzung” (Heym, 1974, p. 89).

The opportunity presented itself in the late 1950s when he had to spend six weeks in the hospital, whereas after writing *Hostages*, he just did not have the time to try and translate the 322-page novel until that point in time.

A lot happened to Heym during the time span in between the publications of *Hostages* and the German translation. After being able to avoid the draft once due to his mother’s financial dependence on him in 1941, the second time he was not so lucky and Heym joined the U.S. Army in 1943, receiving training at various bases. Before being shipped overseas to Europe at the close of World War II, the FBI was investigating Heym and Gertrude because of their communist tendencies. Despite this, he was able to officially become an American citizen and then married Gertrude (Heym, 1988). He returned to America after V-Day and was dismissed from the army because he was still too Communist for American tastes (Zündorf, n.d.). The McCarthy era tried to squelch any communist activity and for Heym, America was no longer the free and democratic country he had once known and believed in when he had arrived years before. The Heym’s left America, spending time abroad (most notably in Prague and in Israel), before finally deciding to leave America for good, around the time the Korean War broke out. They finally settled in the GDR in the early 1950s and by Spring 1953, he made the small socialist state his permanent residence (Hutchinson, 1992). In

the meantime, Heym continued to further his literary output; he published three more novels in the U.S. in the ten years following *Hostages* (*Of Smiling Peace* (1944), *The Crusaders* (1948) and *The Eyes of Reason* (1951)). It suddenly becomes clear why Heym had little time to begin translating: the war, his travels and his new novels.

Der Fall Glasenapp, as it is called in the German translation (“The Glasenapp Case” and not a translation of the word “hostages” which would be “*Geiseln*” in German), thus appeared in 1958 for the first time in the GDR, this time being slightly updated for the new kind of fascism that was “alleged to be rampant in West Germany in the context of the Cold War” (Wallace, 2004, p. 3). The longer-lasting success of the German version seems to show that the changes Heym made kept the book relevant for the new audience in the GDR and in West Germany in general must have worked.⁸

Heym’s experiences post-*Hostages* and the effect such changes had on the original story are important if one is to properly analyze the translation of *Der Fall Glasenapp*. In the following chapters I would like to discuss translation methods and discuss the differences between *Hostages* and *Der Fall Glasenapp*.

⁸ The book has been re-printed numerous times since 1958, the most recent being a paperback version appearing in 2005 by the btb publishing house in Munich.

CHAPTER THREE

TRANSLATION METHODOLOGY

3.1 Translation: More Than Just Words

As with many things in life, the practice of translation is not easily definable. There is a broad spectrum of scholarship dealing with translation studies, but there is no definitive answer for what exactly a translation is. Many say what it is not or have very prescriptive methods for translation, but they do not necessarily make the task of translating any easier or better. These will be discussed below. Every translation is different because every translator is different. Even the same translator working on two separate texts or novels will not always be able to explain their choices; some things just sound right (Weaver, 1989).

If we are to look at the practice of translation and its methodology historically, we must go back about two thousand years. Translation has been used since ancient Rome as a language-teaching tool throughout Europe and is still used today in many educational systems (Lefevere, 1992).

The Roman orator Cicero wrote in an essay entitled *De optimo genere oratorum* in 46 B.C. that he translated speeches from Greek into Latin as an orator and not as a translator (Venuti, 2004a). This meant that Cicero was freely transferring the ideas from the original Greek speeches into Latin using a strategy that was “paraphrastic, [and] focused on the meaning of the foreign text while adhering to Latin norms” (Venuti, 2004a, p. 13). While Cicero argued such translations would make for better orators, Horace wrote in his *Ars Poetica* (circa 10 B.C.) that it could assist poetic composition by adapting the Greek works for a Roman audience (Venuti, 2004a; Venuti, 2004b). Translation could thus be likened to an

act of conversion, the Greek culture subjected to a reworking and allowing the Romans to assert their “cultural authority” (Venuti, 2004a, p. 14). This kind of translation is referred to as free, sense-for-sense or paraphrastic translation (Dryden, 2004; Venuti, 2004b).

In contrast to those who freely translated for speech writing or other purposes, there were those that felt translation should be done on a stricter, more faithful system of equivalence. Venuti labels them “grammarians” or “interpreters” because translation was used in an academic setting for analyzing texts and learning and understanding the languages in use (2004a, p. 13). This way of translating is referred to as faithful, word-for-word, literal, semantic, true or equivalent translation (Lefevere, 1992; Beaujour, 1995b; Venuti, 2004b). Whatever one chooses to call it, this is the kind of translation that stays as close as possible to the original text; there is little or no deviation from the original or source text (ST) to the target text (TT), except perhaps when the target language differs grammatically or idiomatically (for example).

It is interesting that Eugene Nida uses the word “equivalence” to describe both ends of the translation spectrum. He says there are two different kinds of equivalence: a formal equivalence (or “gloss translation”) that is as close to a word-for-word translation as possible and a dynamic equivalence that reads more fluidly and strives for “complete naturalness in expression” in the target language (Nida, 2004, p. 156). In the dynamic approach the meaning and effect of the language prevails over the individual word, being the exact opposite of the formal approach (ibid.).

While both modes of translation have existed since antiquity, the general way of viewing a translation is objective: right or wrong, black or white. As a reader it is easy to point out translation errors (i.e., places where the ST and TT language are not equivalent,

perhaps through awkward passages, grammatical errors, etc.), especially if one knows what to look for. Many “errors” could be attributed to personal taste, however, and this makes the distinction between right and wrong at times subjective. This could also be due to that fact that no two translations are alike, to use Gregory Rabassa’s (1989) notion of translation in which he likens translations to snowflakes. The chances are incredibly slim that two different people would translate the same text in exactly the same way, but this does not necessarily mean that the translators committed errors; as will be discussed below, individual experience and instinct plays a role in the translation process.

Hönig and Kussmaul (1982) provide examples of various kinds of text types and show how cultural references and social cues predetermine certain uses of language when, for example, writing a letter or an advertisement in a newspaper. Such texts are translated in a specific way; there is language associated with the specific genres. In those cases, the translation process is tied to the language deemed appropriate by social customs. At the end of each section of the book, Hönig and Kussmaul ask various theoretical and practical questions about translation and have exercises for the learners to complete, giving their own solutions and inviting students to compare their answers with those of the authors. Questions that Hönig and Kussmaul find important deal with the “Sender” (the one communicating something) and the “Adressaten” (the ones receiving the message from the *Sender*). They do not want people to adhere to the right or wrong mode of thought, but they do want people to think about what the text is saying and about “die kommunikative Funktion eines Textes” (Hönig & Kussmaul, 1982, p. 14) because this is ultimately more important than a word for word transfer of the source language into the target language.

While Hönig, Kussmaul, Lefevere and Venuti (among others) try to explain how

translation works and what translators or students of translation should be careful of, the fact remains that translation is subjective. It differs from disciplines like math or science, which very often have formulas and concepts that can only produce one correct answer. But even math, according to Rabassa, is not as cut and dry as we would think:

“Wishful thinking and early training in arithmetic have convinced a majority of people that there are such things as equals in the world. A more severe examination of comparisons, however, will quickly show us that all objects, alive or otherwise, are thoroughly individual in spite of close resemblances. Schooled as we are from the time of our first letters and figures in such things as $2 = 2$, we rarely wake up to the fact that this is impossible, except as a purely theoretical and fanciful concept, for the second 2 is obviously a hair younger than the first and therefore not its equal. With this in mind, we should certainly not expect that a word in one language will find its equal in another” (1989, p. 1).

Call it nitpicking, but Rabassa does point to the fact mentioned above about the grammarian school of translation, and schooling in general, since ancient times: people have been conditioned, for the most part, to believe there is one, and only one, correct answer for everything. The human condition, however, as we know it, and as Cicero and Horace must have known it, does not allow for every single question to be answered unequivocally. Some things are easier to define than others and sometimes we never come to a conclusion. Individual human experience shapes the way we think and how we express ourselves, and thus, how we translate.

Verena Jung (2004) mentions the importance of intertext and language conventions that shape the way authors write. An author from Germany has a different intertext, or “a collective knowledge distilled from a multiplicity of texts read by the authors or even language usage that they have absorbed” (Jung, 2004, p. 531), which an author from America or England would not necessarily have. For example, Hannah Arendt was able to “take liberties in German that [she] could never possibly take in English,” because she had wider

access to German texts and was able to use this knowledge in her writing (Arendt, 1975, p. 22 cited in Jung, 2004, p. 531).

One of Lefevere's ideas connects to the above, but he takes it a step further and says a language "preexists its speakers or writers; that is, writers and translators are born into a language with its rules and conventions. They do not invent them" (1992, p. 16). This goes beyond what an author reads and knows; it is something that is ingrained in the author from the day they were born: "People have a kind of liking for certain words, either from experience and background or by cultivated preference..." (ibid.).

All of these ideas of intertext, preexisting language and instinct define translation. And as they differ individually, translation differs individually. No matter what the situation is, no translation will ever be perfect. "Naturally, each language poses its own problems, but the practical considerations that go into the making of a translation do not seem to differ much from one translator to the next. All translators agree that the perfect translation remains an impossibility" (Biguenet & Schulte, 1989, p. vii). If this is true, this does not mean translation is a fruitless effort. Literature is a means of communication and a translation transfers information from one culture to another, making it accessible to a wider audience.

Biguenet and Schulte, however, pose questions that can stand in the way of this transference of cultural knowledge: "What kind of interpretive reading must the translator engage in to do justice to a text before the actual translation can take place? How can equivalencies be established between the semantic and cultural differences of two languages? What constitutes a successful translation?" (Biguenet & Schulte, 1989, p. ix).

Since it has already been established across the board that there is no such thing as a perfect translation, translators are trying to achieve an unattainable goal. But, as Biguenet and

Schulte say, there are such things as “successful” or “good” translations. Translators are the most critical readers of texts – they analyze the meaning, context and association of every single word (Biguenet & Schulte, 1989). Rabassa also says the translator “cannot ignore ‘lesser’ words, but must consider every jot and tittle” (1989, p.6). A translator must be as creative and innovative as the original author and is generally never truly satisfied with the finished product. It is argued that a translator’s work is never done because translation is “a process of choice” (Biguenet & Schulte, 1989, p. viii), and “could go on to infinity” (Rabassa, 1989, p. 7). A translation is full of doubt and uncertainty because there is no absolute equivalence:

“Translation is a disturbing craft because there is precious little certainty about what we are doing, which makes it so difficult in this age of fervent belief and ideology, this age of greed and screed...The translator can never be sure of himself [sic], he must never be. He must always be dissatisfied with what he does because ideally, platonically, there is a perfect solution, but he will never find it. He can never enter into the author’s being and even if he could the difference in languages would preclude any exact reproduction. So he must continue to approach, nearer and nearer, as near as he can, but, like Tantalus, at some practical point he must say *ne plus ultra* and sink back down as he considers his work done, if not finished (in all senses of the word)” (Rabassa, 1989, p. 12).

Rabassa uses the snowflake metaphor, Walter Benjamin a broken vase that must be pieced back together or an open marriage “where the laws of fidelity do not hinder the freedom of the flux” (Naqvi, 2007, p. 297), and Margaret Sayers Peden (1989) likens translation to an ice cube because as it melts or re-solidifies, the molecules move around and retain, in essence, the same shape. Nothing can be perfectly reduplicated, but as we shall see below, there are various ways of assessing a translation.

3.2 Everyone Makes Mistakes

Since there is no real equivalence and no two translations will ever turn out to be

exactly the same, errors, whether major or minor, subjective or objective, intentional or unintentional, almost always find their way into translations.⁹ They can appear for many reasons and take many forms. Some categories to consider when translating include culture, situation, speech acts, meaning, register and text type (to name a few) (Hatim & Mason, 1997; Kussmaul, 1995). A list of the most common (literary) translation errors (or categories of errors) and how to assess them will be discussed below.

There are such things as “interferences” caused by false cognates – i.e., German *sensibel* (sensitive) versus English *sensible* (rational/prudent) – or polysemy, a word with multiple semantic meanings – i.e., English *drugs* could be translated either as *Drogen* (the illegal kind) or as *Medikament* (the prescription kind) (Kussmaul, 1995). These are the signs of a haphazard translation or inexperience.

Idioms are a necessary, albeit problematic part of a professional translator’s work and are particularly important to be translated properly (Kussmaul, 1995). Vansina (2004) states, “[s]tandard idioms and routine images should never be translated literally but rendered by the use of an equivalent image or idiom” (p. 486). Clearly a phrase like “I’m so hungry I could eat a horse” would not directly translate into German; the equivalent phrase is “Ich habe einen Bärenhunger”. This is an instance in which a deviation from the original source text is a must.

There are also omissions and/or insertions (or additions), which, depending on their purpose, are hard to categorize (Hatim & Mason, 1997). Is it a question of culture or society (providing necessary information or removing unnecessary information), of censorship or personal taste, of difficulty or of simplicity? It was common practice for certain British

⁹ I would not like to rule out the possibility that there are translators who have successfully interpreted and reconstructed an entire text, but in all likelihood even the best translators make mistakes or deviate from the original.

translators of the Romantic and Victorian eras to leave out parts of stories deemed to be vulgar or tasteless (i.e., Edward Lane or Sir Richard Francis Burton who bowdlerized *Arabian Nights*) (Borges, 2004; Venuti, 2004a), but why would an author leave out a sentence if it contains no crass or vulgar information? Texts with omissions and/or insertions have a different effect on the reader and to get behind the reason for such choices is extremely difficult (Hatim & Mason, 1997; House, 1977). Gutt (1990) argues that

“translations are interpretive uses of language because the source text gives us no more than clues to what is meant, and in the comprehension process the historical, cultural and sociological background is needed to find out what these clues stand for or hint at” (Gutt, 1990 cited in Kussmaul, 1995, p. 61).

He is basically arguing that translators must tease out the meanings of the source text, at times providing the appropriate information that was not in the original.

Kussmaul (1995) gives the example of a text from *Newsweek* in which former German chancellor Helmut Kohl made a comment about Goebbels in German, which was translated, with an explanatory insertion into English. The German sentence: “Goebbels verstand auch was von Public Relations” (*Die Rheinpfalz*, 7 November, 1986 cited in Kussmaul, 1995, p. 69). This then became in English: “Goebbels, *one of those responsible for the crimes of the Hitler era*, was an expert in public relations, too” (*Newsweek*, 27 October, 1986, cited in Kussmaul, 1995, p. 69, emphasis mine). Although it seems redundant to have the German chancellor quoted in the American magazine explaining Goebbels’ identity, it is more appropriate to explicate for the American audience. This kind of insertion is a liberty taken solely by the translator; it is up to them whether or not the insertion is necessary or not for the target text, but the example above would be considered acceptable. This could also be held true in reverse; omissions may be deemed necessary, but only to remove information that would seem superfluous to the audience.

When discussing translation errors in studies conducted with some of his students, Kussmaul states, “[e]rror assessment is focused on *the communicative function* of the word, phrase or sentence in question. Distortion of meaning must be seen within the text as a whole and with regard to the translation assignment and the receptor of the translation” (1995, p. 128). The focus is on how an error (“distortion of meaning”) affects the overall reading of the text. Kussmaul also makes mention of the fact that “opinions on errors often vary considerably” (1995, p. 127) and showed that certain teachers involved in the grading process of the translation students tests involved in his studies had very different ideas about errors. He uses the phrase *experience the world at first hand* from a text that the students translated. One student translated the phrase as *um zunächst einmal die Welt kennenzulernen*. The two teachers assessing the translation agreed that *um die Welt aus eigener Anschauung kennenzulernen* would be a better translation, but they could not agree on how to grade the error. *Zunächst* meaning “first of all”, according to Teacher A, shows the student is not competent in English. Kussmaul, however, agrees with Teacher B: “In the translation there was...no loss of information. As a consequence, one should not talk of an error here and the candidate should not be penalized” (1995, p. 128). As long as the communicative function has been preserved as in the above examples, it is perfectly acceptable to render the image using the appropriate target language forms.

When it comes to careless translation errors, Hönig wonders why readers lower their expectations and accept a text, mistakes and all: “Wie kann es sein, daß wir freiwillig und ohne Not unser Weltwissen vergessen, sobald wir wissen, daß es sich um eine Übersetzung handelt?” (Hönig, 1995, p. 9). This kind of attitude is unfortunate, but true. A translation is given a certain amount of leeway because of the nature of the process. As long as the inherent

meaning is transferred, the readers can pick up where the translation left off and make inferences as to what the target text really says (think of translations of product information or directions that clearly were not done by native speakers – the reader of the target text, i.e., the native speaker, sometimes must play detective to ferret out the meaning behind the words).

Hönig (1995) lists some “rules” that seem to find their way into the minds of translators, even if they are not concerned with translation theory: 1) translate as word for word as possible and as free as necessary, 2) translate as precisely as possible, 3) the correctness of a translation can be checked against a dictionary, 4) it is unavoidable that a translation will lose some meaning from the original, 5) the translator must be careful to eliminate their personal opinions and their subjective value judgments, 6) a translation generally sounds unique and doesn’t read like an original text but that is unavoidable and thus totally normal.¹⁰ These thoughts about translation are what lead to below standard work; they allow for errors to happen and consider them unavoidable. House (1977) also compiled a similar list of principles and calls them “vague” and “bewildering” (p. 7). If translation could be done by following a set of rules or principles, everyone could translate on their own; but as it is, it is not so easy to do.

Basil Hatim and Ian Mason (1997) are concerned with messages or “signals” that are sent from the author to the audience (much like Hönig and Kussmaul’s *Sender* and *Adressaten*) “about the way they view the world, in the way meaning is inferred beyond the words-on-the-page, so to say, and how the resources of language users for doing this kind of thing transcend any artificial boundaries between different kinds of translating” (p. 7).

Once there are translation errors, it is easy to accumulate more and more of them; the

¹⁰ I translated (and slightly paraphrased) these from the German original.

translator must go to some lengths to make sense of the translation (Hatim & Mason, 1997).

“When context is misinterpreted, then, both structure and texture are invariably at risk”

(Hatim & Mason, 1997, p. 176).

There are so many traps and pitfalls a translator can be faced with. The slightest misinterpretation of a sentence or a phrase could set an entire paragraph off. Translation is a very exact and analytic process; understanding the text in every possible way is the key to a good translation. There is no one right way to translate and there is no such thing as full equivalence, but translators who work well at their craft produce good, readable texts.

3.3 Translation or Adaptation?

A question that must be posed is the following: When is it acceptable to deviate from the original source text? One could envision a kind of scale, on one end, free translation (i.e., adaptation), and on the other end a strict, word-for-for translation. Where do certain translated texts fit within this scale? In the case of the 18th and 19th century British translators who heavily censored their translations (as mentioned above), they would obviously fall on the adaptation side of the scale. Vansina and the grammarians would fall on the strict translation side. But what would be considered an appropriate method? Is there a universal right or wrong? The first question is easier to answer than the second, and both questions seem to largely depend upon the type of text being translated and what the translator does with the original.

According to Biguenet and Schulte, “[i]t is a generally accepted fact that literal translations cannot be successful with literary works” (1989, p. xi). Generally the form hinders such a technique, especially when working with the language pair English-German,

and a literal, strict, word-for-word translation would simply fail. The word order and idioms in both languages are in most cases not compatible (although in some instances they are similar). To further the notion of word order, Schmid (1999) focuses on why it is necessary to differentiate between canonical (unmarked) word order and deviant (marked) word order, which carries an “additional meaning potential” (p. 1). This can be particularly difficult when working with the English-German language pair. Schmid feels that word order is bound to convention, but when an author chooses to deviate from it, this is the most important element a translator must focus on. A target language text “should have as close an effect as possible on its recipient as the source language text” not only in meaning but in the structure as well (Schmid, 1999, pp. 1-2).

This is why translating poetry is particularly difficult: the conventions and the canon change from country to country (Lefevere, 1992). In general, poetry is allowed more freedom, but “there is obviously a greater focus of attention upon formal elements than one normally finds in prose” (Nida, 2004, p. 154). When translators of poetry come across certain elements, for example alliteration, allusions or metaphors, they “have to decide where their priorities lie and why” (Lefevere, 1992, p. 20). Can the sounds, references or images brought together be reproduced in the target language without losing the meaning or becoming too absurd?

It is interesting that Kussmaul (1995) uses texts with difficult elements or structures (such as alliteration, idiomatic language, poetic forms such as a limerick, etc.) to assess his students’ translation abilities. Kussmaul wanted his students to think in a fluent manner, i.e., the students should be able produce as many alternatives for a word, phrase or sentence as they can, in order to finally arrive at an appropriate solution. Because he is working with

students, the results are not always stellar, but it shows that a translator (especially one of poetry) must be extremely resourceful and well-read (and well-cultured?) to be able to successfully reproduce all the “formal elements” Nida mentions.

Frame (1989) takes a mathematical approach to translation equivalence. He looks at particular sentences or lines of poetry and tries to approximate the “maximum yield” from the source language into the target language, which is basically a mathematical percentage of how much of the source text can be reproduced into the target language. For example, the maximum yield of a French alliterative sentence into English might be 40% (p. 71). He gives some examples, showing in particular that when working with poetry, one can (and sometimes must) tinker with the target language in order to produce the same effects or sounds as the original (and the general meaning or gist), thus increasing the maximum yield of the translation.

So how far is too far when translating prose for a different audience from the original, or many years (sometimes centuries) after the original was published? It seems as though the words “translation” and “adaptation” are used interchangeably (Rabassa, 1989; Venuti, 2004) and I must say I strongly disagree with the murky distinction between the two. If a translation is to transfer a text from one language to another without losing the meaning and essence of the original, an adaptation is a text loosely based on the original.

Rabassa provides us with a troublesome quote: “Translation is really what we might call transformation. It is a form of adaptation, making the new metaphor fit the original metaphor, and in a bad translation the results can be most procrustean” (1989, 2). If a translation is an adaptation, the original text suddenly loses its “holy” quality – Hönig and Kussmaul (1982) refer to the original text as “Das Heilige Original” – but the two terms are

not one in the same.

The term “adaptation” is very often found in filmmaking and in the theater. Curiously enough, nearly all searches conducted on the term provided results dealing with literary adaptations for the theater or cinema, but very seldom with literary adaptations of, for example, a Greek tragedy being adapted for a modern audience. Anyone who has seen a film adaptation of one of their favorite novels knows how much is lost or changed to fit the culture of cinema and the disclaimer is always given: “based on a novel by...” or “adapted from a novel by...”. As an audience, we must lower our expectations. So what about adapting literature itself? Once again, the British come into play, as they sometimes decided that the texts they translated should be written in a very British context, i.e., the *Iliad* or *Arabian Nights* taking place in England with Victorian architecture, customs and dress (Venuti, 2004a)

Kussmaul too makes mention of the murky distinction between translation and adaptation:

“Enid Blyton’s story is embedded in the British culture... There seems to be a tradition today in the translation of literature... of not transferring the plot into the target culture. As readers we enjoy reading about... the fates of our heroes in foreign, often “exotic” cultures... Werner Lincke does not seem to follow this tradition. He calls his translation a *Bearbeitung* (adaptation) perhaps implying by this term a greater freedom in cultural transfer” (1995, p. 132).

Lincke translates the names of the characters and place names into German, which changes the story significantly. The translation is no longer a story of Britishness; the readers have clearly been planted in Germany. Lincke is then taking the liberty of completely transforming the novel from one of Britain to one of Germany and somehow makes the story his own and not that of the original. This is when translation is no longer true – the translator, to use Faiq’s (1997) term, becomes a “dictator”, manipulating the final product.

The Greek poet Giorgos Seferis once told Edmund Keeley, a noted translator and

scholar of Greek poetry, that he “thought it sinful of a poet to alter his own work once the text of a poem had been published and established as part of that poet’s canon” (Keeley, 1989, p. 63). Seferis also told Keeley: “[Seferis] found it ‘inexcusable’ that [W. H.] Auden should decide to drop a whole stanza of his ‘1 September 1939’ when it was reprinted in his *Collected Shorter Poems, 1930-1944*. ‘Even if your beliefs may change as you grow older, the poem is a work of art that expresses you as you were when you wrote it and therefore has no business changing’” (ibid.). The work thus remains frozen in time, unaltered from the original publication date.

3.4 Self-Translation

The practice of self-translation is an added complexity to the question of what a translation truly is or can be. Self-translation emerges from a certain level of comfort and familiarity with one’s native language and one, or even several, “foreign” language(s). A classic example of a polyglot writer and self-translator is the Russian writer Vladimir Nabokov. He generally favored writing directly in his foreign languages (either English or French) because of the supposed torment and agony the self-translation process can cause (Beaujour, 1995a). The reason for this, according to Beaujour (1995b), is the fact that the brain works and processes information differently while translating than while dealing directly with either language A or language B (i.e., reading or writing in either of the native tongues). Someone like Nabokov would rather just write in the language they feel is most appropriate to express their feelings and ideas and to reach their audience.

There are several concepts that explain the process of self-translation and the phenomenon of polyglot writers and two of them will be discussed below. The first is that of

bilingualism, which, as the name suggests, focuses more heavily on the linguistic aspects of being able to write (or speak, comprehend, etc.) in two languages. The second is biculturality, a term I encountered while reading some of Verena Jung's works (Jung, 2002; Jung, 2004), which tends to focus on the cultural aspects of using more than one language. The two, I would argue, are not necessarily interchangeable terms; they are distantly related and in some cases coincide with one another, but not always.

The generic, lay definition of the word “bilingual” means having the ability to speak two languages like a native speaker or, to use the term so often (ab)used, “fluently” (Hamers & Blanc, 2000), although the term “bilingual” is just as problematic to define as translation.¹¹ Hamers and Blanc (2000) state that there are two kinds of bilingualism, one called societal bilingualism and another they refer to as bilinguality or individual bilingualism. The difference between the two is that the former refers to nations states that come into contact with two languages (i.e., countries or territories that have two or more official languages like Canada, Cameroon, Belgium) and the latter is psychological and refers to a person who speaks two languages for communicative, social purposes (ibid.).¹² In both cases, however, the focus is still linguistic and questions the ability of the bilingual speaker and whether or not they are native speakers of both languages.

What constitutes a native-like speaking ability is widely debated. Are all four dimensions of language learning – reading, listening, writing and speaking – necessary to be considered a native speaker? Or is just the speaking component necessary (Hamers & Blanc, 2000)? Does speaking like a native speaker mean there is no trace of an accent? Is a certain

¹¹ In linguistics, the term bilingual can be used for “balanced bilingual” (i.e., for speakers with native-like abilities in both languages), but also for speakers with one (strongly) dominant language and one (strongly) weaker language.

¹² I would, for example, fall under the concept of bilinguality according to Hamers and Blanc. I chose to learn German and live in Germany to communicate with others of that language community.

regional dialect or variant necessary to deem a speaker native? Does basic language skill (i.e., a student in a first or second semester foreign language class) account for bilingual status, or must one be considered advanced (i.e., beyond the first few semesters of language learning)? There are so many questions and the answers are highly varied.

A language serves many functions and is deeply tied to culture (Hamers & Blanc, 2000). Language development, in both the aspects of the individual foreign language learner and in the way a given language changes over time, is also a dynamic process and is constantly undergoing changes linked to society, technology, globalization and even education (ibid.). To be bilingual one is able to successfully communicate in two separate languages, but this does not mean they are bicultural. This is an element that Jung (2002; 2004) adds to the concept of bilingualism.

Jung (2004) argues that bilingualism is not the sole precondition for self-translating; biculturality is key to a successful (self-)translation. She defines this as an author who has “a cultural status in both language communities” and who has “read literature in both languages” (Jung, 2004, p. 530). Heym listed Hemingway and Twain as largely influencing his writings, perhaps to an even greater extent than German authors (Heym, 1988; Jung, 2004). According to Jung’s theory, this would lend his English language writings a considerable amount of credibility because he is able to draw from an American literary tradition.

However, biculturality and self-translation tend to lead to “freer” translation (to use the ambiguous term). Regardless of the purpose or reason for the self-translation (i.e., living in another country by choice or in exile, publishing academic works, or just because it comes naturally), self-translators “are given the role both of translator and of author’s editor in their writing or re-writing” (Jung, 2002, p. 20). All of the authors Jung (2002; 2004) profiles,

(among them Heym, Arendt, Klaus Mann, Rudolf Arnheim, Peter Hutchinson) prove the point – most certainly in writing for academic purposes – that self-translators significantly edit or change the texts.

Said Faiq (1997) heavily criticizes this as an abuse of power, likening translators to dictators because they are “altering what a group of readers is allowed to know and read; thus, censoring and to a large extent alienating the target readers” (p. 11). Venuti (2004a) also makes mention of the fact that this was quite a commonplace role in translation, especially in 18th and 19th century England. The often upper class and well-educated translators and literary scholars felt the British readers should not be subjected to the kind of crudeness and vulgarity found in various ancient Roman and Greek texts or even the stories in of *Arabian Nights* and decided to simply leave out the offensive parts, sometimes removing entire chapters. This kind of censoring is what Faiq considers dangerous and problematic about self-translation.

Hönig makes a case for the literary translator and what they do with a text: “Literarische Übersetzer betonen gerne die Nähe zu künstlerischen Berufen: Man müsse nicht nur Sprachen können, sondern auch sensibel damit umgehen können, kreativ sein, Vorstellungskraft entwickeln, sich ‘in den Autor hineindenken können’” (Hönig, 1995, p. 19). This is generally true of the translation process, but when dealing with self-translators, as shown above, it becomes much more complex. The original author and the translator are one in the same, and they arguably know what is “best” for the translation.

Vansina (2004), a Belgian historiographer and self-translator from the University of Wisconsin working with French and English (both non-native languages for him), wrote that when he translated a work from French into English, he decided not to alter the text at all – no

updates, footnotes or additions in any way – except for fixing the occasional typo. Vansina seems to follow along the lines of Faiq’s somewhat militant stance of self-translation; he wanted to keep the target text as close to the original as possible.

3.5 Conclusion

In this chapter I outlined the concepts of translation, adaptation and self-translation and what these concepts means when translating. The line between translation and adaptation is slippery, some translators (or self-translators) taking their freedoms too far, some not taking any freedoms at all. The examples and information above was provided in order to show what are considered acceptable deviations from the source text and what falls into the category of adaptation.

In the following chapter I would like to explore the kinds of translation patterns found in Stefan Heym’s translation of *Hostages* into *Der Fall Glasenapp*. Through a detailed analysis of the source text and the target text, I will assess his translation based on the criteria in this chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter some examples were given of acceptable and unacceptable changes that could be made to a translation by a professional translator. Lexical units – here referring to a word, a phrase or a sentence – that may be added are pieces of information (mainly cultural) that would be considered necessary for the target audience; lexical units that may be removed are pieces of information (mainly cultural) that would be redundant or obvious for the target audience. Anything more than this is considered above and beyond the responsibilities and duties of a translator. It is argued that self-translators naturally are allowed more flexibility when they translate, but it is widely debated whether or not this is good practice (Faiq, 1997; Vansina, 2004).

In the case of Stefan Heym, a self-translator, the difference between the original English language novel *Hostages* and the German translation *Der Fall Glasenapp* are good examples of what happens when an author returns to an earlier, foreign language novel and decides to translate it. In this chapter, I would like to present my findings after comparing the two novels. There are some logical and acceptable changes made in *Der Fall Glasenapp*, but there are also some that are illogical and many things that are simply unacceptable if the novel is viewed as a translation. I will provide examples and discuss the effects they have on the reader and the translation in general in order to come up with a final assessment of the translated novel.

4.2 Acceptable Changes – Fixing Errors

Upon reading *Hostages*, one notices many English language errors. It is no surprise considering the fact that Heym had only been using the English language for a few years before writing the novel and that the pressure of the publishing house for a speedy output perhaps did not allow for adequate editing. It is also no surprise that Heym decided to fix the errors in *Der Fall Glasenapp*. It would make absolutely no sense to keep them in the German version.

An example of some of the kinds of errors he made in the English version is easily identified in the following sentence: “I’ve seen it **on** pictures the Nazis have sent from the Ukraine and from **Jugoslavia**” (Heym, 1942, p. 101).¹³ He used an incorrect preposition (because in German one says “auf dem Bild” and not “in dem Bild”) and spelled Yugoslavia more like its German equivalent *Jugoslawien*. Another interesting spelling error was the use of the word “clew” (1942, p. 217), which according to Merriam-Webster’s Online Dictionary is an antiquated form of “clue”. Another error that the writer made is the use of a false cognate for the German word *Dom*. In English, the German word *Dom* can of course mean “dome,” but not in the context of *Hostages*. Heym was referring to St. Vitus Cathedral (*Veitsdom*) and should have named it accordingly (1942, p. 182).

Heym also used phrases such as “This was meat for him” (p. 21) and “The twilight, instead of dulling Milada’s features, emphasized plastically her strange beauty” (p. 85). The first phrase must be some sort of German idiom translated directly into English (unknown to the native speakers and dictionaries I have consulted, but perhaps *Das war ihm Wurst?*), which of course makes no sense to American readers. The probable translation also does not

¹³ Further references to either *Hostages* (1942) or *Der Fall Glasenapp* (1958) will be made with the year, followed by the corresponding page number, or in some cases just the page number.

fit the context in English. The preceding sentence reads: Gruber grew enthusiastic. Gruber is in the Gestapo and arrives at the café just as hostage situation begins to unfold. Being a young officer, he was eager to exert his authority and control over the others and liked making the Czech café patrons uneasy – he wanted to teach them to fear and respect the German Gestapo. It would then be safe to assume that the “meat” sentence must mean something like *This was his cup of tea* or *This was right up his alley*. This is the sentiment Heym captures in *Glazenapp* and simply translates it as: Gruber war nun wirklich interessiert. The second phrase reads awkwardly. Heym seems to be trying to use the German *plastisch hervorheben* and literally translated it into English. A better choice of words may have *highlighted* or simply *emphasized* in place of “emphasized plastically”. The German translation reads: Im Dämmerlicht trat die eigentümliche Schönheit des Mädchens noch deutlicher hervor (p. 92).

In reference to escaping Reinhardt’s men, Breda says: “I’ve learned to elude stool pigeons. **Prague is a wonderful city**; just think of all the crooked streets and interlocking passages, the dark stairways and the pillared niches of its solid old walls” (p. 186, emphasis mine). The sentence in bold seems a bit out of place. The German version makes the connection clearer: “Nur habe ich gelernt, wie man Spitzeln ausweicht. **Für so etwas ist Prague eine großartige Stadt**” (p. 198, emphasis mine). Something so simple, even two or three words, can make a significant difference.

These are just a few examples of Heym’s struggle with his new pen language; he had not yet mastered the language but polished up the awkward passages in the translation.

While many of these errors or awkward passages are insignificant, many of them have a jarring effect on the reader because they occur at least once every few pages (sometimes more frequently). In addition, I found it particularly interesting how Heym used German

words and phrases throughout *Hostages*. The usage was inconsistent; I counted five such examples throughout the novel. The first three of them were in Chapter 6 (beginning on page 126 and the following pages), the other two appeared in Chapter 10 and Chapter 14 (see below). These sorts of things literally get lost in translation, because the German words and/or phrases in *Hostages* lose their special emphasis in *Glazenapp*, where only German (with the occasional Czech name) is used. The use of German in *Hostages*, place names in particular, at times seems odd and sometimes the reader is confronted with a kind of English-German hybrid (see below). It is not always clear why Heym decided to incorporate the German into *Hostages*, but it is confusing and unnecessary for the English speaking audience (see below).

Some of the uses of German were probably due to the fact that Heym had no access to the correct information, especially when talking about Prague. The Lesser Quarter and the Old Town are referred to by their German names, *Kleinseite* and *Altstadt* (1942, p. 40), but Heym attempts to translate some place names into English and does so incorrectly. The Charles Bridge is misnamed Karl's Bridge in *Hostages*, a mixture between *Karlsbrücke* and *Charles Bridge* (ibid.). He also calls Charles Square *Karl's Place*, a direct translation of the German *Karlsplatz* (1942, p. 179; 1958, p. 191). However, he uses *Karlsplatz* in German, being the proper name for it and an acceptable way to reference Charles Square in German. Karl's Bridge and Karl's Place, however, are mistranslations,¹⁴ something that professional translators would be severely reproached for because the cultural transfer is flawed. Heym

¹⁴ This is a difficult error to classify. Perhaps they would be better referred to as back translations. Heym's native language is German, so he is taking the German names and trying to translate them into English, which he then corrects as he translates them back into German in the German version.

fortunately does not try to translate the other Czech place or street names, so the readers are kept safe there. In *Glazenapp*, all places and names are appropriately labeled.

Heym makes use of various phrases in German, some of which may be recognizable in English, but some perhaps less so. He uses the word *Dummkopf* (1942, p. 127), which many English speakers know and if they are unfamiliar with the term, *dumm* is very clearly a cognate with *dumb*; the meaning can be inferred. When the hostages are about to be executed, instead of shouting “ready, aim, fire,” the German equivalent of *Achtung, legt an, Feuer* (1942, p. 353) is used. From the context the meaning is easily implied. These examples are perhaps not so problematic. It is not uncommon for an author to pepper their works with the language theoretically spoken in the novel, i.e., *Hostages* is a novel about the Germans occupying Prague, so the languages theoretically being spoken in the novel are primarily German and Czech. But then we have examples where the use of German seems out of place. For example, the sentences “No waiting, no circumstances, *durchgreifen!*” (1942, p. 126) or “*Stille Wasser sind tief*” (p. 129) or “If we release you, those *Untermenschen* will say: Hostages, ha ha – the Nazis don’t mean it anyway” (p. 245) seem a bit out of place. Perhaps Heym thought they were easily understandable or recognizable enough for an American audience, but the emphasis and meaning behind the German words might be lost on an American reader. The messages would have been clearer in English.

4.3 Acceptable Changes – Audience Appropriate

A few other noteworthy changes show that Heym was writing for a different audience. The reference to *Alice in Wonderland* (p. 55) is changed to *Dornröschen* (p. 60), finding a suitable German equivalent to the classic English children’s tale. The explanation of what

Slivovitz is (“that clear Czech prune schnapps”, 1942, p. 126) becomes unnecessary for the German audience and is simply called “Sliwowitz” (1958, p. 134).

There is also transference of cultural knowledge in the love scene between Breda and Milada. Breda’s apartment is decorated with a picture of a man with an “Emperor Francis Joseph beard” (*Kaiser-Franz-Josef-Bart*) (1942, p. 183; 1958, p. 195). This may be clear to some Americans, but how well known was the Kaiser, especially with an Americanized version of his name? Just to be safe, a translator’s trick would be to add “Austrian Emperor” before the name, in order to ensure that everyone comprehends the reference. This is, of course, unnecessary for the German audience.

4.4 Unacceptable Changes – Translation Oddities

As seen above, some of the names remained untranslated; the German names were used in place of the English equivalent in *Hostages*. But this is not so throughout the novel, as Heym changed some names and retained others. Some of the character names in *Glaserapp* were Germanized: the hero of the story Janoshik, becomes Janoschik in the German version and Frantisek becomes Frantischek. Some of the names are different, but the reason for this is harder to comprehend: the brothel owner Wilhelmina Tietjen receives the nickname Willie in the English version (and her brothel is called Willie’s place, p. 160), while in the German version she is called Tante Minchen (Tante Minchens Turnverein, p. 171). When Janoshik refers to his boss, he simply says “my boss” (1942, p. 174), whereas in the German version the boss gains a name: “Herr Walzl, unser Chef” (1958, p. 186). Why Heym decided to change these is unclear.

Some of the place names receive similar treatment. It is clear that Heym is inconsistent with his choice of names; he cannot seem to decide whether or not to use the German names, the Czech names or poorly translated English names. The general rule is to use the proper target language names (i.e., the Champs Élysées would not be translated) unless the source language name is difficult to understand in the target language and there is an acceptable target language equivalent (i.e., the Branderburger Tor is called the Brandenburg Gate in English).

The café in which the hostages are taken into custody goes from Café Mánes to Café Parnaß. The hotel in which Reinhardt has a few drinks, however, is called Hotel Alcron in both versions (1942, p. 158; 1958, p. 168). The district in which Heydrich, the Reich Protector, resides is called by its German name in both versions: Hradschin (the Czech name is Hradčany, which is also the proper English name, although some trade the “č” for a “c”). For certain city names in the English version, Heym uses the Czech names (Hradec Králové or Olomouc) but then in the German version gives the corresponding German names (Königgrätz or Olmütz). He keeps the street names, for example the Královská street or the Malá Štěpánská, in Czech in both versions, but he is obliged to provide an explanation of the layout of the latter street (there is a main Štěpánská street with a small branch of it that splits off and leads through a small alley-like residential area).

There are also some changes to certain words or concepts that are easier to understand. The tobacconist (p. 257) becomes a Bäckermeister (p. 272), the barges and longshoreman (p. 9-10) become Gleise and Eisenbahner (p. 13); a shift is being made to more common cultural references – to the local baker and the railway for the Germans. The guard with the “silver stars on his collar” (1942, p. 239) is transformed into a fat man (“der Dickere der beiden SS-

Leute”, 1958, p. 252). One could speculate that Heym believes the more decorated a soldier is, the fatter he is because he has access to more money and better food.

Heym also makes mention of the song “Red Morning Sky” (1942, p. 194). Milada refers to it as “an old song,” whereas in German it is a “Soldatenlied” called “das Lied vom roten Himmel” (p. 206).¹⁵ It is significantly shorter in the German text, but it is unclear as to whether or not the original is English or German, or if Heym wrote the song himself. It could be that he learned it during the war, but it is not mentioned in any of the sources.

There were a few other unexplainable changes, like changing the third grade to the sixth grade, converting 400 feet (which equals 121.92 meters) into “dreihundert bis dreihundertfünfzig Meter” (which equals 984 to 1,148 feet) and changing millions of people to hundreds of thousands. In Breda’s apartment there were “a couple of chairs” (1942, p. 183), whereas in German there were exactly “zwei Stühle” (1958, p. 195). This could be attributed to the fact that *a couple* in Heym’s mind might have been the German equivalent *ein Paar* (literally “a pair” or “a couple”) and not the English *a couple* meaning *a few* (which would be rendered as *ein paar* in German). This makes sense on a more detailed analytical level, but it would appear as if Heym is breaking a rule of translation: never interpret or add unnecessary information for the author – ambiguity in the original must be transferred into the translation.

Some of these caught my eye when reading the two versions; many of these changes do not make sense. In essence, no information is lost; it is just changed from the original without a clear reason as to why the things were changed. This would, however, still be considered unacceptable for the average, professional translator. The only thing that would be

¹⁵ It is unknown to me whether or not such a song actually existed. I tried to find the text and/or the melody, but was unsuccessful.

considered all right from the above examples would be to convert the distance (400 feet) directly into the metric equivalent.

4.5 Unacceptable Changes – Changes in Register, Insertions, Omissions, Form

The changes listed in the above sections are, however, in comparison to what is to follow, quite minor. Heym generally tried to improve upon his amateurish American novel but in doing so, as we shall see, not everything he did was so “innocent”.

In terms of register, Heym tends to remove the more crass language he employed in *Hostages* in *Der Fall Glasenapp*. This is a form of censorship on Heym’s part. Phrases like “shut up” became milder, like “Ruhe” or “genug” and some things he omitted altogether (which will be discussed in detail below) but a clear example of this is when talking about how the drunken officer Glasenapp entrusted Janoshik with a letter to mail. The officer told Janoshik he would not be able to see the mail slot even “if it were as big as Hess’s asshole” (p. 171). The German version reads, “wenn er so groß wäre wie dem Rudolf Heß sein Hinterer” (p. 182). “Hintern” being a milder word than the English word Heym chose, meaning “behind” or “backside”. Perhaps more curious than his choice of words is the fact the Heym did not explicate who Rudolf Hess was for the American audience.¹⁶ This might have been due to the fact that the Americans knew his name during wartime, but it also could have been an oversight for the politically active Heym.

The most striking feature of the translation is the number of insertions and, most specifically, the omissions. As discussed in section 2.2, there are certain instances in which inserting or omitting information is acceptable. One example of such an acceptable

¹⁶ Rudolf Hess (or Heß in German) (1894-1987) was a prominent member of the Nazi Party. He acted as Hitler’s Deputy Führer, was caught by the British during WWI, was tried at Nürnberg and was sentenced to life in prison.

insertion/omission was already given in section 3.3: Slivovitz. Technically speaking, the explanation of the drink was inserted for the American audience and removed for the German audience.

Many of the insertions are small: an extra adjective or a descriptive phrase, an extra aside or sentence; none of them were longer than a sentence and none of them were of the same function of the Slivovitz example. They added information or dialogue that had no sort of basis in cultural understanding (see Table 1 below). They are insertions that Heym somehow felt were necessary or felt like the information was missing from the original and decided to add it to the German version.

Table 1. Insertions

<i>Hostages</i>	<i>Der Fall Glasenapp</i>
“Mind you, I am not accusing any of you. Not yet, at least” (p. 15).	“Das soll nicht heißen, daß ich einen von Ihnen, <i>meine Damen und Herren</i> , anklage. Jetzt noch nicht, jedenfalls” (p. 19, emphasis mine).
The heavy burden of the facts she knew had been throttling her ever since she had read the Glasenapp poster. From the moment its text had penetrated her consciousness, her mind had been full of frantic ideas (p. 81).	<i>Dabei drängte alles in ihr nach einer Aussprache.</i> Seit sie das Glasenapp-Plakat gelesen hatte, war die Wahrheit, die sie doch wußte, wie eine Last auf der Brust gewesen, die drohte, ihr die Kehle zuzuschnüren. Und je mehr der Text in ihr Bewußtsein drang, desto toller waren die Ideen gewesen, die ihr in den Kopf kamen (p. 88, emphasis mine).
How gracious she is! Gracious and clever. She could drive a man out of his senses, especially a weakling like Glasenapp (p. 138).	Großartige Figur – biegsam, graziös! <i>Und dazu sah das Mädels noch gescheit aus.</i> Klar, daß sie einem Mann seine fünf Sinne verdrehen konnte, und besonders einem Schwächling wie dem Glasenapp (p. 147).
Preissinger closed his eyes. His body swayed. “Take everything,” he croaked, “take it! Take it! I want to live!” (p. 248)	Preissinger schloß die Augen. Er schwankte <i>und hielt sich an seinem Stuhl fest.</i> “Alles!” krächzte er. “Bitte, bedienen Sie sich! Ich

Table 1 continued

	will leben!” (p. 262, emphasis mine)
“Glasenapp was most definitely murdered. Suicide, my dear doctor, is typical of a decadent race” (p. 297).	“Der Mord an Glasenapp ist nun einmal eine Tatsache. Selbstmord, werter Herr Doktor, ist nur für dekadente Rassen üblich, <i>die sich auf dem absteigenden Ast befinden</i> ” (p. 307)

The insertions, though, are not a major feature of Heym’s translation. I counted around 35 to 40 small insertions and some of them were hard to classify because of the way they were structured in German. Many seemed more like changes in the register (see the above Hess example)¹⁷ or form because of the nature of the German language (i.e., the grammar, the syntax, etc.). The main focus and the reason for this analysis is the overwhelming amount of omissions from *Hostages* to *Der Fall Glasenapp*.

My system for classifying the omissions is as follows: A small omission ranges from a few words (a part of a sentence) to a short, but full sentence (generally one or two lines of text). A medium omission can range from one long, but full sentence (generally three or more lines of text) to a paragraph of text (which vary in length but I counted anything up to six lines of text). The category for large omissions is the broadest. Some omissions ranged from parts of a longer paragraph (seven or more lines) to full paragraphs (once again, anything over seven lines), several paragraphs at a time, or even much larger omissions or rearrangements of the text, sometimes spanning multiple pages. The number of omissions per chapter and their size can be seen in Table 2.

Der Fall Glasenapp is 360 pages of text and there are a total of 385 omissions or cuts

¹⁷ Register is sometimes dictated by culture or social situation. Lefevere (1992) defines register as the “specific use of language...in a specific situation” (p. 58) and uses the example of addressing the Queen of England to show language uses considered appropriate and/or inappropriate.

Table 2. Omissions per chapter by size

	Small	Medium	Large	Chapter Total
Chapter 1	18	-	-	18
Chapter 2	19	-	-	19
Chapter 3	16	1	-	17
Chapter 4	14	3	-	17
Chapter 5	19	3	-	22
Chapter 6	12	3	-	15
Chapter 7	11	5	-	16
Chapter 8	28	12	1	41
Chapter 9	9	4	3	16
Chapter 10	9	2	-	11
Chapter 11	18	2	1	21
Chapter 12	21	8	3	32
Chapter 13	39	28	4	71
Chapter 14	36	25	8	69
Total	269	96	20	385

Total omissions: 385

from the original text. This averages out to slightly more than one omission per page (approximately 1.07). This might not seem like much, but the nature of the omissions goes beyond what is normally considered acceptable for a translator to do. The page count of each chapter ranges from 19 to 30 pages (the average falling around 25 or 26 pages) but it seems that this did not necessarily affect the amount of omissions, meaning the number of pages in a chapter has no correlation to the amount of omissions (for example, the longest chapter, Chapter 9 has 30 pages and 16 cuts, whereas Chapter 14 has 26 pages and 69 cuts). I will discuss the chapters with the most significant differences, because they heavily weigh upon the final judgment of the overall translation of the novel.

If the style of *Der Fall Glasenapp* can be characterized as *sachlich*, it can also be said that it seems as though Heym wanted to take out the “schmaltz” that was in *Hostages*. The book for the American audience read at times more like a made-for-Hollywood script, especially in Chapter 8 when the love scene appears.

Very often there are inner monologues because the novel deals with the psyche of the hostages in their last days before being executed. Many of these are cut short. In connection with this, the emotions and feelings of the characters, psychical and mental, are also truncated. Certain metaphors or bits of the story that do not forward the plot are removed. Heym’s translation can be considered much plainer, more factual and perhaps a bit sterile.

To show how the style of *Hostages* changed, a good parallel can be shown between two specific passages. In Chapter 12 the psychiatrist Dr. Wallerstein’s behavioral report of the hostages filled with clinical, dry language is left untouched (the text has been reproduced as it is found in both novels – the report in both versions was written in italics as shown below).

Table 3. Chapter 12, Wallerstein's Report

<i>Hostages</i>	<i>Der Fall Glasenapp</i>
<p><i>NOTES ON DEATH AND THE DISINTEGRATION OF PSYCHIC STANDARDS</i></p> <p><i>By Walter Wallerstein, M.D.</i></p> <p><i>Greater and more incisive, more cataclysmic than any other experience in human life is the one which ends it: dying.</i> <i>Not only the body, but also the psyche stops functioning. For reasons of convenience Medical Science and Society in general have established a qualitative deadline for the process called death. We issue a certificate when the heart muscle has permanently ceased to pump blood. We know, however, that dying and living are processes complementing each other, that parts of our living tissue die off constantly. We say, speaking of certain clinical cases: He takes a long time dying (p. 298).</i></p>	<p><i>BEMERKUNGEN ÜBER DAS STERBEN UND DEN VERFALL PSYCHISCHER NORMEN</i></p> <p><i>Von Dr. med. Walter Wallerstein</i></p> <p><i>Größer, einschneidender, aufwühlender als jede andere Erfahrung des menschlichen Lebens ist die, welche ihm ein Ende setzt: das Sterben.</i> <i>Nicht nur der Körper, auch die Psyche hört auf zu funktionieren. Aus praktischen Gründen sind die medizinische Wissenschaft und die menschliche Gesellschaft im allgemeinen dazu gekommen, in dem Prozeß, der vor sich geht, eine Linie der qualitativen Veränderung zu ziehen, die den Namen Tod hat. Wir stellen einen Totenschein aus, sobald der Herzmuskel für immer aufgehört hat, Blut durch die Gefäße zu pumpen. Wir wissen jedoch, daß Sterben und Leben Prozesse sind, die einander ergänzen, und daß Teile des lebenden Gewebes dauernd absterben. Wir sagen auch, wenn die Rede auf gewisse klinische Fälle kommt: er braucht lange zum Sterben (p. 308).</i></p>

The German version of the excerpt, although it appears longer, is a perfect example of a true or literal translation.

However, passages evoking emotions (whether grief, pain, love, etc.), such as in Chapter 8 the love scene between Breda and Milada, were drastically cut. In Table 4, the italicized words and sentences represent (roughly) what was omitted from *Der Fall Glasenapp*.

Table 4. Chapter 8

<i>Hostages</i>	<i>Der Fall Glasenapp</i>
<p><i>My flesh is burning, sweet, consuming fire. A thousand sense-threads bind me to him, each one seeking him, tasting him, drinking him. Let there be no single nerve orphaned! Each one must receive him, his immense glowing wonderful life, each one must be blessed. Feel him, his shoulders and his thighs, his belly and his chest. Drink his warm breath, the honey from his tongue the blood from his lips, the life from his limbs. This is the sea, the wild joyous sea. We swim exulting, borne by its waves from unfathomable depths up into the sky, the clouds. We soar like birds, strong birds with wide-spread wings, supported by the storm, flying to the sun – up and up and up.</i></p> <p><i>I am a fireball. I am light, oh so light. This man in me, this beloved child. I carry him with me to unscaleable heights, to infinite azure. I can do it, I am the master, the mother, immortal, receiving and giving. Now I have reached it. Nobody, ever, ever, ventured so high. How lonely I am, this man in me is just a cell, a kernel of life, a fetus. I shall bear him. Look at the space, the nothingness!</i></p> <p>The rocket bursts. Oh, the joy of unfolding and of diffusing yourself and of shedding yourself the world over, <i>spending, spending</i>. She sank back. The man in her arms, how helpless he lay. He smiled and kissed her, <i>shyly, as one kisses the hem of the blue gown of the Virgin</i> (p. 195, emphasis mine).</p>	<p>Ich will, daß jeder Nerv ihn spurt! Jeder Nerv. Ihn fühlen, seine Schultern und seine Schenkel, seinen Leib und seine Brust. Seinen Atem trinken, das Süße von seiner Zunge, das Blut von seinen Lippen. Ich spüre keine Last, ich bin die Herrin, die Mutter, unsterblich, empfangend und gebend. Ganz hoch oben am Himmel birst eine Rakete. Wie schön das ist, sich so zu entfalten und zu ergießen und zu verströmen über die ganze Welt. Sie ließ sich zurücksinken. Der Mann in ihren Armen – wie hilflos er dalag. Er lächelte und küßte sie (p. 207).</p>

The difference in length even in this short excerpt from the entire passage shows the major differences between the storytelling in *Hostages* and *Der Fall Glasenapp*. The version from

Hostages is almost a full page of text and is reduced to two three small paragraphs (approximately two-fifths of the original source text is retained).

In Chapter 8, Milada enters Breda's apartment and despite its bareness she tells him: "I like it here. The room could stand a woman's touch, though," she added with an attempt to smile" (p. 184). In *Glazenapp* we find simply: "Mir gefällt's hier" (p. 195). In general, any passages that seem campy or melodramatic in the English version are cut from the German. Things like the following: "Yet everything in her was opening up to him; she felt as though the outer covering of her heart had been removed, and with every beat her heart sent a wave of seeking warmth to him" (p. 184) or "She wanted a lodestar, a guiding light on which to fix her eyes when the enemy tried her again" (p. 186) or "His heart ached... Oh, to tear down the clouds from the night's sky, to uproot the foundation stone of all this wickedness!" (p. 190) or (my favorite) "She had waited for these words as the ivy waits and searches for the tree around which it can grow to the sun" (p. 192) are all removed from the German translation.

Over the next few pages, especially when the two characters make love, Heym cut significant amounts of text (see Table 4). He uses lots of metaphors and imagery of space, the elements, the body, etc., which are almost entirely missing from the German version. Perhaps Heym just wanted to spare his German readers the details or perhaps he personally did not like the original passages and thought their removal would enhance the flow of the storytelling. Personally, I would have to agree with his judgment, although translation-wise I would beg to differ with his decision.

The chapter that underwent the biggest changes was Chapter 12. The actual number of omissions seems relatively modest, but one of the omissions spanned over a page and another was an omission/adaptation of the storyline that affected nine consecutive pages. The

reason for these cuts is unclear, but both of these larger cuts remove the presence of the character Otokar Simek, the Nazi announcer of Radio Prague (1942, p. 281-283). In the first significant cut, Breda, who works with Janoshik in the underground Nazi resistance movement, gives the history of the character and how he came to be despised for going against his own people. Because he is removed here, it affects a later part of the same chapter because he appears again in *Hostages*.

The second cut, the largest of the entire novel, involves Breda and his two compatriots, Frantisek and Podiebradsky, who are planning on breaking into the house where Simek lives. They find Simek alone, overpower him and render him unconscious. Phase one of their plan is complete. They transform Breda into Simek's spitting image and phase two of their plan is underway – Breda has a falsely labeled recording of a text Breda prepared exposing Reinhardt's hostage plot and appealing to the Czechs to act against their Nazi oppressors, and, dressed as Simek, will sneak into the radio station and have the record played. In *Hostages* we never actually see if Breda completed his task until later on when the recording is heard on the radio. In *Glazenapp*, because the character of Simek is gone, Breda and his friends have a different plan. The three men go over their plan to sneak into the studio in detail and the reader actually sees Breda enter the studio and fool the guards on duty into thinking he is there to repair the heater. In essence, the main objectives of the storyline have been fulfilled – Breda and his recording make it somehow into the studio. *Hostages* makes it a bit more ambiguous and *Glazenapp* gets the reader closer to seeing the task completed, but there is next to nothing that is actually translated in either of these passages. A total of about ten pages in this chapter of *Hostages* have absolutely no connection or relevance for *Glazenapp*.

We also see the sterilization of the German text taking place in Chapter 12. The very beginning of the passage in Chapter 12 in which Reinhardt is lost in thought begins with: “‘Milada!’ said Reinhardt dreamily, smacking his lips as in the aftertaste of some agonizing sweetness” (p. 294). In *Glaserapp* it simply reads: “‘Milada!’ sagte Reinhardt fast träumerisch” (p. 304). Heym makes it very clear that Reinhardt is fascinated with Milada, the Czech beauty, and cannot get her out of his mind: “It seemed to him that a bit of the fragrance of her being was left hanging in the room; a faint sounds to which he was listening, the rustling of her steps” (p. 294). The German version removes this. Another example is when shortly thereafter Dr. Wallerstein enters Reinhardt’s office: “Wallerstein felt tired, tired and weak. Standing before the Commissioner’s desk hurt his legs, and he wished the whole futile procedure was over” (p. 296). In German it becomes this: “Wallerstein fühlte sich müde, und er wünschte nur noch, er hätte das ganze Theater hinter sich” (p. 306). Some of Dr. Wallerstein’s pain and suffering is removed.

Chapters 13 and 14 had the largest number of omissions. Almost every single page in both of these chapters had at least one, if not several cuts. Although the bulk of the cuts in these chapters were generally smaller in nature, they make a significant difference to the way *Glaserapp* reads. The nature of the omissions was consistent with the other chapters – emotions, metaphors, inner monologues, philosophical ponderings, overdrawn descriptions and other melodramatic language usage were removed.

Table 5. Chapter 13, Reinhardt

<i>Hostages</i>	<i>Der Fall Glaserapp</i>
Reinhardt had suffered a letdown <i>after having expounded upon the plan for a world with the Reich Chancellery in the Wilhelmstrasse as</i>	Reinhardts heroische Stimmung hatte sich verflüchtigt. Er hatte gehofft, Eindruck auf Milada zu machen, wobei es ihm gleich war,

Table 5 continued

<p><i>its hub. He, however, knew why he had gone out of his way to hold forth upon the beauties and the magnitude of the New Order. As a representative of this immense new world conception he expected to impress Milada, either as a sincere fighter or as an inexorable terror. And his disappointment arose from the fact that she, too paid in the inspiring currency of philosophy.</i></p> <p><i>If he had failed to impress her, she did impress him. He was tired of cowering and silent victims whom he could dispense with by the usual means. The physical attraction which the girl exerted changed and became a definite challenge.</i></p> <p><i>A challenge to him as a man (p. 328, emphasis mine).</i></p>	<p>ob er ihr mehr durch seine kämpferischen Qualitäten oder durch seine unerbittliche Haltung imponierte. Wenn er jetzt enttäuscht war, kam es daher, daß sie ihm gleichfalls mit weltanschaulicher Begeisterung gekommen war.</p> <p>Milada war eine einzige Herausforderung (p. 337).</p>
---	---

In this short passage – it is less than a half page of text – the version in *Glaserapp* has a total of three cuts: two medium cuts and one small cut (a little less than half of the source text is retained).

In addition to the aforementioned changes, Heym also takes the liberty of changing up the form of the text – not all paragraphs line up and the text breaks in *Hostages* occur less frequently than in *Glaserapp*. Perhaps this was a stylistic choice of Heym's, but due to the numerous omissions, it appears as if Heym felt it was all right to consolidate and merge some of the paragraphs. This is a special question the translator faces – the form of the text. Some do not vary from the original form and punctuation; others do this much more freely. In Heym's case, the omissions and insertions at times made it almost necessary to consolidate or expand to aid the flow of the storytelling. The writing conventions in English and in German are not so different from one another to necessitate significant changes in form and Heym did

not make any severe changes to it. However, many of the changes appear to be stylistic choices on Heym's part, and would therefore be unacceptable for a professional translator to change without good reason.

In this chapter various patterns or practices have been uncovered in the translation. Language errors and awkward passages in the original were fixed, place and character names were properly Germanized, a few cultural references were changed to accommodate the new German audience, some information was inserted, lots was removed or changed and the form of the text was slightly altered from the original. In the following chapter the findings will be analyzed and the translation of *Hostages* into *Der Fall Glasenapp* will be given an overall translation assessment.

CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS

5.1 Translation Assessment

Given my interest in deciding whether *Der Fall Glasenapp* should be considered a translation or an adaptation of *Hostages*, I discussed the definitions of a translation and an adaptation in previous chapters. If one were to envision a continuum between the two states, a more faithful, word-for-word translation being on the one end and an adaptation of a text on the other end, this would be helpful when discussing the translation of Heym's novel (see Figure 1 below).

Figure 1.

The translation-adaptation continuum



About the first half of the book and Chapter 10 were only slightly altered, a few insertions or omissions here and there. But other chapters such as 8, 12, 13 and 14 underwent major reconstruction, at times the storyline undergoing complete transformations. Therefore, the book as a whole is a bit more difficult to classify.

It is hard to understand why the first half of the novel or so does not undergo as many alterations as the later half. Did Heym suddenly realize that he had this power over the translation? The kinds of things he removed from the later chapters are also present in the

earlier ones, so why did he not omit them from the beginning? These are questions in which only speculative interpretations can be made. Perhaps as Heym went on, he became a bit tired of the kind of language he used in the original and eventually decided to drop the Hollywood schmaltz. In general, the style of *Glazenapp* seems to be a bit more direct, to the point and less emotional (the German word *sachlich* comes to mind). Whatever his reasons, it is a strange phenomenon. The lack of consistency with the translation would lead the assessment of the novel to scale higher on the free translation/adaptation side.

The insertions are also definitely another strike against labeling it a translation. Many, if not all of them, were not of the acceptable kind; they were adding information that was not there in the original and played no part in cultural understanding for the German audience.

The omissions also hurt the overall assessment of the translation of *Hostages*. Because there were so many, it makes puts the translation farther down on the adaptation side of the continuum. In general, if one were to see a translation in which lots of material was omitted, it is either assumed that the translator censored the text (Venuti, 2004a) or had difficulties expressing the thoughts and therefore left them out. Both are considered grave offenses when judging the work of a translator. Omissions, much like insertions, are only deemed necessary when information for the original, source culture or audience was necessary, but then was rendered unnecessary for the target culture. While these in all likelihood are not the motivating factors to Heym's changes, he overstepped his bounds as translator. Most of Heym's improving adaptations can be "excused" by the fact the he is self-translating, but strictly speaking, the two novels, although clearly the same story, do not uniformly share the same characteristics.

Whereas certain chapters could be assessed as a more literal translation (for example

Chapter 10) other chapters would be assessed as adaptations (without a doubt Chapter 12).

This means the overall assessment of the translation of *Hostages* into *Der Fall Glasenapp* falls somewhere in the middle of the continuum. It is somewhere between a free translation and an adaptation, due to the inconsistencies of certain translated elements and the volume of unacceptable insertions and omissions.

If Heym had mastered the English language before writing *Hostages*, it could safely be said that the novel would have earned a place in the annals of English exile literature. As we know, this was not so. *Hostages* has only been printed twice since 1943, a second version appearing not with Putnam's, but with Sun Dial Press. *Glasenapp*, however, has been reprinted several times since 1958, and most recently as 2005.

This is definitely an indication of the staying power of Heym in his native country of a story written in his native language. *Der Fall Glasenapp* shows why Heym is still to be spoken of in Germany, but at the same time why *Hostages* was nothing more than a fleeting success in the eyes of the American WWII public. It was a quick and captivating read and the movie quickly followed, but that too has not been spoken of since. It is out of print and even the review of the film written in the New York Times in 1943 was quite harsh:

“Another story of the German overlords versus the Czech underground, it pursues the notion that villainy creates its own checks and balances—a theme for intelligent and fine-edged melodrama. But fine-edged is not the word for ‘Hostages,’ which is simply blunt...In any event, Paramount's collaborators have allowed the fine irony of an interesting idea to sift through their fingers. What remains is no more than a conventional film about the underground movement...Because it lacks direction it lacks excitement; because it misses the truth it fails to entertain. In melodrama it is when you cheat that you are dull” (*Hostages*, 1943).

All in all, it was a lousy film. It was merely a moneymaker that was swiftly forgotten. The sudden fame was, however, definitely deserved – Heym is one of the most talented 20th century German writers – even though *Hostages* is not truly representative of Heym's

superior writing talents and storytelling capabilities due to the language difficulties he occurred. It is like the work of an amateur, and his financially driven decision to write his very first novel may have been wise at the time, but it really brought him nothing more than a few dollars. It did, however, give him the chance to improve upon such a wonderful novel. Without ever having ventured to write *Hostages*, who is to say that Heym would have written *Der Fall Glasenapp*?

Heym wrote *Hostages* at a time when the threat of Nazis was real and the repression was going on. Heym himself was a victim of such persecution. The novel takes place in Prague and shows the Nazis as nothing more than irrational, egotistical, power-hungry, self-righteous bullies. His “translation” of *Hostages* really made for a wonderful German novel. Heym unfortunately says very little about the translation process and how much time and effort he put into it, but his autobiography gives us clues as to how meticulously he worked in general and how intelligent he was (i.e., his amazing work ethic, his charm, his creative, yet political side, his output of literature and newspaper articles, his unwavering devotion to his beliefs, etc.). That he allowed himself the task of coming back to his fledgling novel and make a true masterpiece out of it is something very few writers could trust themselves to do. Even translators do not enjoy reading a work they have translated after it has been published because as Nida reminds us that there is no such thing as a perfect translation (Nida, 2004).

I do not view Heym’s *Der Fall Glasenapp* as a faithful translation; I tend to agree with Ian Wallace and lean towards the label he bestows upon it as “adaptation”, although I place it as somewhere in between a free translation and an adaptation. And while reading *Hostages* caused me to cringe in many places, reading *Der Fall Glasenapp* was definitely one of the most enjoyable German literature experiences I have had.

5.2 Heym as (Self-)Translator

Stefan Heym definitely shows that he is a “professional” translator – or at least thinks like one – in his autobiography. Heym states:

“Es ist das alte Problem der adäquaten Übersetzung, mit dem S. H. sich so häufig herumgeschlagen hat bei denjenigen seiner Bücher, die er selber übertrug, entweder aus dem Englischsprachigen ins Deutsche oder umgekehrt: eine jede Sprache hat ihr Eigenes, das in der anderen fehlt, zumindest in seiner ursprünglichen Form” (1988, p. 549).

He acknowledges the fact that translation is an arduous task and that every language has its own form. According to the linguist Eugene Nida, this is definitely true: “Since no two languages are identical...it stands to reason that there can be no absolute correspondence between languages. Hence, there can be no fully ‘exact’ translations” (2004, p. 153). The difference can be seen in the quality of the translation, which my translation professor told me is best judged by how the translation reads in the target language; the more fluid and less awkward it reads, the better the translation (Elizabeth Lowe, personal communication, 2009). Trueness or exactness to the form of the original is more a personal or stylistic choice.

This choice has different outcomes on the original because it is at the mercy of the translator. It is widely debated which style is considered better, but it really depends on what is being translated, who is translating, who the intended audience is, etc. I would argue, that for a novel, the dynamic approach would lend itself better to dialogue, and to storytelling in general. And although Heym tried his best at keeping the language “dynamic” and testing out his Chicago-branded slang, it reads awkwardly in many passages.

When recalling an anecdote from his time in the U.S. Army, Heym comes across the phrase “tough shit”. How could this be translated into German? He looks up *tough* and finds “zäh, hart, bruchfest, kräftig, robust, schwierig, unangenehm” in the German dictionary

(Heym, 1988, p. 369ff.). But when combined with the German equivalent of *shit* it just does not mean the same thing. “Es steckt eine Menge Ironie in der kurzen Redewendung” (ibid.) and Heym comes to the conclusion that *tough shit* can only be translated as *tough shit*. This shows Heym’s prowess as a translator, but of course, there are so many things in English and in German that have no equivalent. This makes translation a difficult task, but as a self-translator, Heym could explore his options and in the German version make the necessary equivalents to spare the book from having an awkward, formal style as is often found in *Hostages*.

The German “translation” of course reads smoother than *Hostages*, being written in Heym’s native tongue, but curiously enough it seems as though the English version followed the German version, instead of preceding it, meaning that the English version reads like more like an amateurish translation rather than the polished work the German version is. This kind of phenomenon could be referred to as “back translation”, which is when a translated text is re-translated into the original language (i.e., a text in German which was translated into English, is once again translated back into German, generally by a different person).

One concept that helps explain Heym’s rough first English language novel is that of “interlanguage”, a mixture between the mother tongue and foreign tongue, applied to translation studies by Paul Kussmaul (1995), which explains certain language mistakes.¹⁸ This could be the reason why certain language choices were made in his earlier English novels – he had not yet mastered the language. Heym had only spent a few years in America before writing and one could argue it is perhaps not enough to tackle a novel in a second language. Heym was still thinking in German and there are definite traces of this in *Hostages*

¹⁸ The term “interlanguage” was created originally in the field of Second Language Acquisition by S. P. Corder (1978) in *Error analysis and interlanguage*.

(as highlighted in Chapter 4 of this paper). Vansina (2004) mentions that he himself felt comfortable translating his work from French to English, because he had been “using both of [the languages] on a daily basis for nearly half a century” and had the necessary intertext (to use Verena Jung’s term) in the subject field (in his case, African history) to successfully translate texts. If Heym had the same experience with English, his early English language novels might be viewed in a different light today; his interlanguage would have proved less problematic and perhaps *Hostages* would still be read.

Lacking English skills notwithstanding, *Hostages* was not the only book he wrote and self-translated.¹⁹ Lefevere (1992) makes mention of the two broad categories in translation of language usage: locutionary and illocutionary.²⁰ The former refers to the syntactical and grammatical usage of the language, i.e., grammatically correct sentences. The latter refers to the effect of the language, i.e., what the language actually means or does (sometimes a secondary or almost hidden meaning). Difficulties can arise when transferring both locutionary and illocutionary forms and meanings from the source to the target text. Lefevere states: “Because language is the expression of a culture, many of the words in a language are inextricably bound up with that culture and therefore very hard to transfer in their totality to another language” (1992, p. 17).

It seems that Heym is cognizant of the fact that American readers of the World War II era are very different from German readers in the German Democratic Republic more than ten years after the end of the war; the translated novel shows this by taking on the new qualities mentioned in Chapter 4 (i.e., more direct, less emotional storytelling, etc.). But why change so much? What was it that caused Heym to deviate highly from the original in many sections

¹⁹ Heym’s initial novels, like *Hostages*, were written during his time in the U. S. in English.

²⁰ These terms are originally from John L. Austin’s (1962) *How to do things with words*.

of the novel?

First, the changes can be attributed to the fact that Heym felt it necessary to improve upon the original grammatically and idiomatically. These are appropriate changes because keeping mistakes or awkward language does not add, rather it subtracts heavily, from a translation. Part of the reason for his quick production of *Hostages* is due to the fact that Heym was under pressure from the publisher and he wrote the bulk of his novel in an almost isolated manner. He spent weeks in New Hampshire, working at a feverish pace and had little or no access to outside reference materials, which most likely would have aided the writing of *Hostages*. The translation, however, was a voluntary project of Heym's; he could take his time and look up the information he needed.

Secondly, some of the changes might have been related to his age. As a young man, full of passion and lust, Heym must have felt it natural to write about lovers and emote about feelings. As an older, perhaps hardened middle-aged man, he decided this was no longer necessary for the story and simply removed it.

Curiously, the changes were not due to a political nature, which might have been expected for Heym, a member of the Communist Party living in the GDR. His political and living situation in 1958 is clearly different from that of 1942, in which he was beginning to consider himself American (Heym, 1988). However, it has been suggested to me that a movement in GDR history, that of socialist realism, may be accountable for the removal of many of the sex/love scenes (Carl Niekerk, personal communication, 2010). The roles of men and women tended to be more (but not exclusively) conservative in the ideal socialist society. Women were part of the workforce and upheld the values of socialist realism, so viewing women solely as sexual objects was frowned upon.

Thirdly, the time in between the two novels must be discussed as a few events may have influenced his translation. Heym was called into military service for the U. S. right after *Hostages* was published and participated in a “Psychological Warfare School” of the British Army. It was very different from most people’s experiences during the war: “hier gibt man Intelligenz-Tests, die wirkliche Intelligenz erfordern, hier wird Psychologie gelehrt, Massen- und Individual-Probleme werden behandelt, der Mensch in Gefangenschaft, mit denen er sich in *Hostages* beschäftigt hat...” (Heym, 1988, p. 308). His experiences with the U. S. Army gave him a much broader knowledge base of the field of psychology and he extensively studied the psyche of hostages. Heym also went back to Prague with his wife, Gertrude, before settling in the GDR, re-familiarizing himself with the layout and the atmosphere of the city. These are events that most likely sharpened his storytelling in *Glazenapp*, although it is not glaringly evident from the translation (except for perhaps the correct German place names and the more concise inner monologues of the hostages in *Glazenapp*).

With this knowledge that Heym acquired in the sixteen year stretch between books at the forefront, Ian Wallace uses the term “improving adapter” (2004, p. 6) to describe Heym’s approach to translating. I agree with Wallace’s label due to the fact that Heym had several advantages when translating *Hostages*. One major advantage Heym had, which all self-translators enjoy, was having absolute authority over the translation (which was also mentioned in Chapter 2). All translators have the option of going to the author (if still living) or consulting the original and/or native speakers if difficulties arise, but Heym *wrote* the original, giving him more flexibility to interpret the text as he saw fit. He was able to cut things out, add things when necessary, rearrange sentences and/or paragraphs, and in general, improve upon the original. The other major advantage Heym had was now being able to

translate the work *into* his native language, instead of working from it. All the translation coursework I have done stressed the importance of translation from the second language (L2) into the native language (L1) and it generally makes sense for most people who typically are not like Nabokov and do not consider themselves truly bilingual or trilingual and so on.

Although he did not quite adhere to the rules of translation, *Der Fall Glasenapp* is a vast improvement upon *Hostages*. *Glasenapp* is at times a fairly faithful translation, at other times a very free translation and at yet other times seems like an adaptation. The novel as a whole cannot be considered a true and faithful translation, rather a hybrid of the three parts of the translation-adaptation continuum, generally moving up or down to suit the author's purpose.

5.3 Conclusion

It is most unfortunate that Heym's *Hostages* is a lost work in English literature. As much as Heym would have liked, he was unable to keep a hold on the American public. The German public seemed much more receptive and thus *Der Fall Glasenapp* and many other of Heym's works are still read today in Germany.

Further avenues for research on the topic of self-translation could be to analyze works of other self-translators (like Hannah Arendt or Klaus Mann) and see if any of the differences found in the Heym translation are found in the works of others as well. Another possible idea would be to look at Heym's other self-translated novels and look for parallels between the translations to see if similar conclusions can be drawn about the works, or if *Hostages* is an exception to Heym's translation process. Because Heym was an exile writer of a different kind, a study could be done between the works of Thomas Mann and Stefan Heym (the

former having writing solely in German during his exile, the latter writing for the most part – definitely his novels – in the language of the host country during his exile) to explore whether or not living in exile causes a writer to self-translate or write in a foreign language.

The study of self-translation is not as rich as translation theory in general, due to its rare occurrence, and I hope I contributed to the field in some way on this subject. My analysis of *Hostages* and *Der Fall Glasenapp* may perhaps be helpful to others who take an interest in the topic of self-translation.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. J. O. Urmson, (Ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Beaujour, E. K. (1995a). Bilingualism. In V. E. Alexandrov (Ed.), *The Garland companion to Vladimir Nabokov* (pp. 37-43). New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Beaujour, E. K. (1995b). Translation and self-translation. In V. E. Alexandrov (Ed.), *The Garland companion to Vladimir Nabokov* (pp. 714-724). New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Beiträge zu einer Biographie: Eine Freundesausgabe für Stefan Heym zum 60. Geburtstag am 10. April 1973*. (1973). Munich: Kindler Verlag.
- Bentley, E. R. (1943). German writers in exile 1933-1943 (a stock taking). *Books Abroad*, 17(4), 313-317.
- Biguenet, J., & Schulte, R. (1989). Introduction. In J. Biguenet & R. Schulte (Eds.), *The craft of translation* (pp. vii-xvi). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Borges, J. L. (2004). The Translators of the *Thousand and One Nights*. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation studies reader* (2nd ed.) (pp. 94-108). New York: Routledge.
- Clue. (n.d.). In Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/clue>
- Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dryden, J. (2004). From the preface to Ovid's epistles. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation studies reader* (2nd ed.) (pp. 38-42). New York: Routledge.
- Faiq, S. (1997, July). Author-cum-translator: Position and power in translating oneself. Paper presented at the conference Translation and Power, University of Warwick, England.
- Frame, D. (1989). Pleasures and problems of translation. In J. Biguenet & R. Schulte (Eds.), *The craft of translation* (pp. 70-92). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hahn, R. U. (2003). *The democratic dream: Stefan Heym in America*. Berlin: Peter Lang.

- Hamers, J. F. & Blanc, M. H. A. (2000). *Bilinguality and bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. London: Routledge.
- Heym, S. (1942). *Hostages*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Heym, S. (1974). Wie *Der Fall Glasenapp* entstand. In G. Schneider (Ed.), *Eröffnungen. Schriftsteller über ihr Erstlingswerk* (pp. 81-90). Berlin and Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag.
- Heym, S. (1988). *Nachruf*. Munich: btb Verlag.
- Heym, S. (2005). *Der Fall Glasenapp*. Munich: btb Verlag.
- Hönig, H. G. (1995). *Konstruktives Übersetzen*. Tübingen: Stauffenberg Verlag.
- Hönig, H. G. & Kussmaul, P. (1982). *Strategie der Übersetzung: Ein Lehr- und Arbeitsbuch*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Hostages (1943). The Screen; at The Globe. (1943, October 11). *New York Times*, Retrieved from http://movies.nytimes.com/movie/review?_r=4&res=9C05E7DE113CEE3BBC4952DFB6678388659EDE
- House, J. (1977). *A model for translation quality assessment*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Hutchinson, P. (1992). *Stefan Heym: The perpetual dissident*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hutchinson, P., & Zachau, R. K. (2003). Introduction. In P. Hutchinson & R. K. Zachau (Eds.), *Stefan Heym: Socialist – dissenter – Jew* (pp. 7-9). Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Jung, V. (2002). *English-German self-translation of academic texts and its relevance for translation theory and practice*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Jung, V. (2004). Writing Germany in exile – the bilingual author as cultural mediator: Klaus Mann, Stefan Heym, Rudolf Arnheim and Hannah Arendt. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 25(5/6), 529-546.
- Keeley, E. (1989). Collaboration, revision, and other less forgivable sins in translations. In J. Biguenet & R. Schulte (Eds.), *The craft of translation* (pp. 54-69). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kussmaul, P. (1995). *Training the translator*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translating literature: Practice and theory in a comparative literature context*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.
- Naqvi, F. (2006). A melancholy labor of love, or film adaptation as translation: Michael Haneke's *Drei Wege zum See*. *The Germanic Review*, 81(4), 291-315.
- Nida, E. (2004). Principles of correspondence. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation studies reader* (2nd ed.) (pp. 153-167). New York: Routledge.
- Peukert, D. J. K. (1987). *The Weimar Republic: The crisis of classical modernity*, trans. Richard Deveson. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Rabassa, G. (1989). No two snowflakes are alike: Translation as metaphor. In J. Biguenet & R. Schulte (Eds.), *The craft of translation* (pp. 1-12). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Sayers Peden, M. (1989). Building a translation, the reconstruction business: Poem 145 of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz. In J. Biguenet & R. Schulte (Eds.), *The craft of translation* (pp. 13-27). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Schmid, M. S. (1999). *Translating the elusive: Marked word order and subjectivity in English-German translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Vansina, J. (2004). A note on self-translation. *History in Africa*, 31, 483-490.
- Venuti, L. (2004a). Foundational statements. In L. Venuti (Ed.) *The Translation studies reader* (2nd ed.) (pp. 11-20). New York: Routledge. (can these be combined?)
- Venuti, L. (2004b). Introduction. In L. Venuti (Ed.) *The Translation studies reader* (2nd ed.) (pp. 1-9). New York: Routledge.
- Wallace, I. (2004). Stefan Heym's *Hostages* (1942): writing and adapting a bestseller. *New Readings*, 7, Retrieved from <http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/euros/subsites/newreadings/volume7/wallace.html>
- Weaver, W. (1989). The process of translation. In J. Biguenet & R. Schulte (Eds.), *The craft of translation* (pp. 117-124). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Zachau, R. K. (2003). "My literally roots lie in American and English literature": Stefan Heyms Traum vom Sozialismus in Amerika. In P. Hutchinson & R. K. Zuchau (Eds.), *Stefan Heym: Socialist – dissenter – Jew* (pp. 13-31). Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Zündorf, Irmgard (n.d.). *Stefan Heym: Journalist, Schriftsteller und Politiker*. Retrieved from <http://www.hdg.de/lemo/html/biografien/HeymStefan/index.html>.

APPENDIX A: POEM

The poem, written by Stefan Heym in 1931, has been reproduced as it appeared in *Beiträge zu einer Biographie*. Following the original an English translation by Peter Hutchinson (1992, pp. 9-10) is provided.

Exportgeschäft

Wir exportieren!
Wir exportieren!
Wir machen Export in Offizieren!
Wir machen Export!
Wir machen Export!
Das Kriegsspiel ist ein gesunder Sport!

Die Herren exportieren deutsches Wesen
zu den Chinesen!
Zu den Chinesen!

Gasinstrukteure,
Flammengranaten,
auf arme, kleine gelbe Soldaten –
denn davon wird die Welt genesen.
Hoffentlich
lohnt es sich!

China, ein schöner Machtbereich.
Da können sie schnorren und schreien.
Ein neuer Krieg –
sie kommen sogleich,
mit Taktik und Reglement und Plänen
Generale, Majore!
Als ob sie Hyänen der Leichenfelder seien.

Sie haben uns einen Krieg verloren.
Satt haben sie ihn noch nicht –
wie sie am Frieden der Völker bohren!
Aus Deutschland kommt das Licht!
Patrioten!
Zollfrei Fabrikanten von Toten!

Wir lehren Mord! Wir speien Mord!
Wir haben in Mördern großen Export!
Ja!
Es freut sich das Kind, es freut sich die Frau.
Von Gas werden die Gesichter blau.
Die Instruktionsoffiziere sind da.

Was tun wir denn Böses?
Wir vertreten doch nur die deutsche Kultur.

Export business

We're exporting!
We're exporting!
And it's military officers we're transporting!
We're into export!
We're into export!
Playing war is a healthy sport!

The bosses are sending things Germanic, if you please,
To the Chinese!
To the Chinese!

Gas instructors,
Flame throwers,
At poor, small yellow soldiers –
The world will then get rid of disease.
Let's hope
It's got scope!

China, a splendid power sphere.
There they can scrounge and shout.
A new war –
They'll soon be here
With tactics and regulations and plans,
Generals, majors!
Like hyenas on corpse-fields, roaming about.

One war for us they went and lost,
But they're still hungry to fight –
They gnaw at peace at others' cost!
From Germany comes the light!
Patriots, you see!
Manufacturers of death – tax free!

It's murder we teach! Murder we spew!
Murder's our export, we do quite a few!
Clear?
The child is pleased, his mother too.
The gas is turning faces blue.
The officer instructors are here.

Anything wrong with what we do?
Just German culture is what we feature.